

THE

SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 904, Vol. 35.

February 22, 1873.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE SPANISH REPUBLIC.

THE confident expression, after an experience of three or four days, of an opinion that the last Spanish Revolution was creditable and successful indicated the levity of recklessness or inexperience. No prudent politician will venture to prophesy the fate of the Republic, although the dangers which beset it from within and from without are obviously formidable. In some rare cases a leap in the dark is safely accomplished; and it may possibly appear that Spain was fortunate in attaining a result which the great majority of the population, including nearly the whole of the upper and middle classes, had deliberately and repeatedly deprecated. At the time when an unexpected eulogy on the Republic was published in England the scanty information on Spanish affairs seemed to ordinary observers not altogether encouraging. It was true that a few days had elapsed without general massacre or spoliation, and that, except in the Northern provinces, no civil war was raging. Experience, which has of late years not been scanty, shows that immediately after a revolution the party which has succeeded to power is on its good behaviour, while the adherents of the former Government are, in the reaction from the first panic, surprised and grateful to find that they have not been yet seriously molested. It is not on the morrow of the catastrophe, but on the day after, that its true bearings and consequences become gradually disclosed. The partisans of the new system soon become clamorous for their reward, and the defeated party, especially if, as in Spain, it forms the great majority, begins to regard with resentment and shame the supremacy of its adversaries. The scattered accounts which were at first received from Spain were not in themselves reassuring. The workmen of Barcelona turbulent expressed their interpretation of Republican institutions as a machinery for providing them with higher wages and with shorter hours of work, and for promoting the doctrines of the International Association. It was reported that the Cortes had decreed the abolition of titles or rank, and that some municipal bodies were distributing arms to the people. In such cases the people mean the violent and disorderly portion of the populace, which is perhaps more bloodthirsty in Spain than in any other part of Europe. All prisoners in custody on the charge of participation in Republican disturbances have been let loose; and officers who, in defiance of law and military duty, had refused to take the oath of allegiance to the KING, have been restored to the rank which they had justly forfeited. The most gloomy anticipations of the tendency of the Republic have thus far been fulfilled, although it is possible that ulterior disasters may by some unforeseen method be averted.

The triumph of the Republicans, whatever may be its ultimate consequences, was only rendered possible by incapacity and by the general absence of political instinct. The late PRIME MINISTER, when he became aware of the KING's determination to abdicate, allowed the secret to transpire without taking any precaution for the safety of the State, or for the maintenance of legal order. It was the business of the Government, as soon as the throne was vacant, to propose the appointment of a Regency; and perhaps under capable leaders the Cortes might not have been too much frightened to discharge their plain and obvious duty. From their constituents they had, with the exception of the small Republican minority, received the mandate to support the Monarchy which had been established or recognized by the Constituent Cortes only three years ago. Since the Revolution of 1868 there have been three general elections, and in all these the principle of monarchy has been affirmed. The present Cortes derived its legal existence from the Constitution which it has now in a panic, and in spite of the convictions of a majority of its members, lawlessly over-

thrown. The Constituent Cortes had not only decreed the maintenance of a Monarchy, but it had by a large majority summoned to the throne the Prince who has now been worried into abdication. Señor ZORILLA and his colleagues, following the example of their opponents of every jarring faction, inflicted on the KING the affront which finally determined his abdication. It is possible that they may have been justified in accepting the resignations of the Artillery officers; but the appointment of HIDALGO was highly injudicious. The Republicans who have seized upon the Government are alone exempt from the charge of political poltroonery; but, unless their audacity is justified by the use which they may make of their power, they will be primarily responsible for a revolution which, if it ends in failure, will have amounted to a crime. The promoters of a Spanish Republic are bound to take notice of the various meanings which different classes of Republicans attach to their common designation. A few political dreamers understand by a Republic an orderly and responsible Government not encumbered with the trappings of royalty; but to the populace of the large towns, and to the inhabitants of many rural districts, the Republic implies confiscation or community of property; and a large section, if not a majority of the party, desired to split up the State into a loose Federation. For all the acts of the Republican factions their nominal leaders who now form the Executive Government are primarily answerable.

Notwithstanding the lamentable origin of the Republic, it may perhaps be the duty of a good citizen, if indeed honest men ever take part in the political affairs of Spain, to support the new Constitution as long as it is found compatible with the protection of property and the maintenance of order. The Ministers in their published utterance display a nervous anxiety to dispel the universal dread of impending anarchy. The Government, with unconscious irony, affects to rely "on the respect for the laws which is inherent in the Spanish people," at the moment when it has been ostentatiously disregarded by the Cortes in the establishment of the Republic. "With all the authorities calmly fulfilling the duties of their offices, all the public powers in full possession of their rights, the Cortes, united in one National Assembly, voted the Republic." In other words, the authorities were powerless to defend the rights which were betrayed by the representatives of the people. Spanish Ministers abroad are enjoined to assure foreign Governments that "this Republic represents the national will, and represents public order." It remains to be seen what guarantee for public order will be effectual when the populace has been armed by the local authorities. While Señor CASTELAR strives to impress on his countrymen and foreigners the convictions which he holds himself, he is evidently conscious that the establishment of the Republic depends on the assent of the army. In one short Circular he recurs several times to the subject of his chief anxiety. Spain has a "tranquil people and an obedient army." The Government relies "on the fidelity of the army." "The Spanish army is resolved to maintain our authority." Of the fidelity and obedience of the army, and of the resolution to maintain the authority of the present Government, Señor CASTELAR as yet knows little, and he evidently fears much. The generals and officers of the army, with few exceptions, detest the Republic; nor can there be a doubt that, if they can reckon on the obedience of their troops, they will take the first opportunity of effecting a counter-revolution. It is possible that Republican emissaries may succeed in creating a division between the lower and the higher ranks of the army. At the beginning of the French Revolution the rabble of Paris was led and directed by mutinous soldiers of the French Guard and of other regiments which had thrown off the authority of their officers. General HIDALGO, who was appointed to his present

post by the actual Minister of War, won his promotion by sharing in a conspiracy of the non-commissioned officers of Artillery against their superiors. The extreme Republicans propose to disband the regular army, and to entrust the defence of the country to lawless volunteers. It is possible that the privates would be glad to accept their discharge; while the officers will to the utmost of their power resist a measure which would be fatal to their interests. General CORDOVA himself has never hesitated to desert a failing Government; and it is possible that he might in case of dissension throw in his lot with the army rather than with the Republic. The recent conduct of SERRANO and of the other military chiefs is wholly unaccountable. They cannot but have anticipated that their studied rudeness to the KING might at any moment cause his abdication; yet it would seem that they were utterly unprepared to profit by the success of their policy. SERRANO had quarrelled with the KING because he was not allowed as Minister to exceed the limits of the Constitution in dealing with the Republicans and other disaffected factions. It is impossible that he should approve of a result which he thought that the KING would be justified in preventing even at the cost of a constitutional irregularity. SERRANO himself and SAGASTA are now said to have disappeared through fear of popular violence, while ZORILLA himself, who was a fortnight ago the undisputed leader of the Radical party, has found it prudent to take up his residence in Portugal. The clerical party, which had done its utmost to render the position of the KING untenable, now sees its whole possessions in danger and apprehends an active persecution. SERRANO and TOPETE must bitterly regret their share in the ill-fated revolt against ISABELLA II. In Spain, where, according to PRIM, no Republicans were to be found after the Revolution of September, a Republic is now formally established. Any statesman who prefers a Monarchy to a Republic ought to beware lest, in overthrowing a dynasty, he may disturb the foundations on which the institution rests. It was better to tolerate for a time the caprices of an unprincipled sovereign than to place the community at the mercy of conspiracy and chance. King AMADEO, in declaring his resolution to abdicate, delivered a just criticism on the political character of the nation which had called him to the throne and then refused to fulfil the implied conditions of his acceptance. The prospects of Spain are more gloomy at the present moment than at any time since the termination of the civil war which followed the death of FERDINAND VII.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR'S BILL.

WHEN Lord HATHERLEY, now three years since, produced his Bill for the fusion of Law and Equity, we, as ardent and almost fanatical worshippers of that idea of Law Reform, felt bound at once to express our profound disappointment at the projected scheme, and to anticipate the failure which ultimately beset it. Much discussion followed, which threw a flood of light on the causes of that deplorable miscarriage, and in considering the Bill of the present LORD CHANCELLOR it may not be amiss to recall the errors, more of policy than purpose, which made his predecessor's effort abortive.

Lord HATHERLEY's measure failed mainly for three reasons. The first and most important, in the eyes at any rate of thoughtful and sincere reformers, was that the fusion which he desired to introduce was more nominal than real. The second blot was that he offended at once against practical common sense and constitutional feeling by proposing to delegate to an outside Committee the filling up of a skeleton scheme far too momentous to be left to any hands but those of Parliament itself. The third element of failure—one of tactics merely, but not on that account the less perilous—was that he offended the susceptibilities of the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE and the great majority of the Common Law Bench. And it must be remembered that all this was done by a man of unparalleled acuteness, moved by the most single-minded desire to remodel our system of judicature on the purest and the soundest basis.

Lord HATHERLEY has been succeeded in his office and his ambition to effect a great work of legal reform by a CHANCELLOR who adds to legal acumen a far greater measure of political experience than the late Chancellor could boast; and all who know anything of the bent of Lord SELBORNE's mind know that in sincere devotion to the cause of Law Reform he is not surpassed by any one on the Bench or at the Bar. These were good grounds for hoping that the difficulties which have baffled all former efforts in the direction of a comprehensive reform would yield to the genius, the energy, and the tact of the present LORD CHANCELLOR. We indulged in these

anticipations more freely perhaps than most, and we are the more grieved to confess the blank disappointment with which the CHANCELLOR's Bill has filled us. One may almost despair of ever seeing done what Lord HATHERLEY and Lord SELBORNE have successively failed to accomplish, or even adequately to conceive. To all who still hope against hope for the thorough reformation of the administration of justice, who are still bent on struggling for complete unity against the influence of professional prejudice and personal susceptibilities, it may not be wholly useless to compare the Bills of 1870 and 1873, and seek the reason why the last state of Law Reform seems even worse than the first. Of the three errors of Lord HATHERLEY's tactics, the LORD CHANCELLOR has—at no small cost to his scheme—entirely escaped the last; he has in some degree, but more in appearance than in reality, avoided the second, and has grievously aggravated the first and most fatal objection to the earlier measure. Mindful, no doubt, of the extreme vivacity of the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE's attack upon Lord HATHERLEY, Lord SELBORNE has carefully guarded against exposing himself to the blows of so formidable an antagonist. In the speech in which he introduced his Bill he mentioned that he proposed to retain the designation and the constitution of the existing Courts "as a concession to sentiment." Until we saw the Bill we had no idea that this "concession to sentiment" was the key-note of the whole composition. But it is so, as we shall presently more fully show, and the measure may be aptly described as a scheme for merging Law in the larger jurisprudence of Equity just so far as the sentiment of the Common Law Bench will allow and no further. This policy will have its reward, and however much the Bill may be deteriorated by it, its chance of passing will be materially increased by the tact with which the sword of the LORD CHIEF JUSTICE has been parried. Whether the Bill will be worth passing on such conditions is a graver question, on which thoughtful law reformers may not agree with the verdict of experienced politicians.

With equal prudence, though with scarcely equal skill, the LORD CHANCELLOR has taken much pains to escape the imputation of leaving the essentials of his measure to be fashioned by the delegated authority of an extra Parliamentary Committee. It was obvious that, after the indignant protests of Lord CAIRNS and others, it would be hopeless to bring forward a Bill which might be made to mean anything or nothing, at the will of a Select Committee of Judges or Privy Councillors. In order to meet this objection, which was the immediate cause of the defeat of the Bill of 1870, the LORD CHANCELLOR promised to include in a schedule to his Bill the rules of procedure by which he proposed to work out his scheme. He has accordingly added such a schedule, but its provisions are so crude and incomplete that he has found it necessary to introduce clauses in the Bill itself for the purpose of perfecting it. One of these, the 69th, coupled with the following clauses, gives to the Judges a power, which clearly must be vested in some authority, of modifying the rules of practice and procedure from time to time, after the Act shall have come into operation, and working defects shall have disclosed themselves. This is quite right; but there is another clause, the 68th, which delegates to a Special Committee the power of filling up, before the Act comes into operation, the skeleton schedule of rules which is added to the Bill. Practically it is obvious that the real procedure of the Courts will be the creation of this Committee, and, to the extent to which this is so, Lord SELBORNE will have fallen into the very same error which proved fatal to Lord HATHERLEY's Bill. Whatever has to be done before the commencement of the Act can be as well done before the vote of Parliament is taken as afterwards, and ought to be so done, in order that the mind of Parliament may be expressed upon the subject. The usual provisions for laying the rules on the table of both Houses are contained in the Bill; but every one knows how little protection is ever derived from arrangements of this kind. If the Government are not prepared to make their Bill complete in the first instance, it would be much better that the schedule should be perfected by a Select Committee of the House of Lords before the measure is passed than that this duty should be left to the proposed Committee, which is composed of the CHANCELLOR, four Common Law Judges, one Equity, one Admiralty, and one Bankruptcy Judge—not a wholly satisfactory Committee, even if a Committee were wanted at all. But these, in some sense minor, criticisms sink into insignificance compared with the supreme defect of the whole measure.

Lord HATHERLEY introduced a scheme under which the fusion of Law and Equity would have been much more

nominal than real, and those who have taken a deep interest in this great question will not perhaps forget that Lord PENZANCE, his only thorough supporter in the House of Lords, justified his policy on the ground that it was idle to dream of a real fusion of Law and Equity, and that to create a nominal unity which should in practice leave existing discrepancies almost unchanged was the utmost that could be rationally attempted. Lord SELBORNE has improved on this opinion, and his scheme is not only almost but, with a very slight exception, altogether a nominal fusion. To call the aggregate body of our existing Courts by the sounding title of the Supreme Court of Judicature is in itself of course only a change of name. To say that the Court of Queen's Bench shall also be called Division No. 1, the Court of Chancery Division No. 2, and so on, is in itself equally a nominal change. To say that the business shall, as a rule, be distributed among these divisions exactly as it is now, is to exclude all real union. And these are the main provisions of the Bill, so far as they bear on the great central question. That the Bill contains some positive enactments is true, but they are provisions not so much for blending the dissevered jurisdictions as for crippling and mutilating that branch of English jurisprudence which alone has shown itself capable of vitality and growth during the last two or three centuries. Apart, however, from these provisions, which will require some detailed consideration, we are profoundly convinced that Law and Equity never can be fused except in name by any Act of Parliament which groups all the Common Law Judges in one set of Courts and all the Equity Judges in another, and rigidly preserves to each section in practice the special jurisdiction which it has been accustomed to exercise. What is the use of saying that each Court shall have universal jurisdiction if rules are framed for distributing the business in precisely the same grooves which it has hitherto followed? And this is in the main what the Bill is intended to do. No one can believe that this is Lord SELBORNE's ideal of a comprehensive reform; no one can doubt that a project so suicidal is merely the result of that "concession to 'sentiment'" which prompted the retention of the ancient designations. Whatever large-phrased enactments may be introduced declaring that Law and Equity shall be administered by every Court, the essence of the project is nothing but what Lord PENZANCE described as his narrow ideal—a nominal fusion which should leave things to go on as nearly as possible after their old fashion.

If we consider for one moment what the system is with which a reformer has to deal, it will be obvious that it cannot be righted by any such method as this. It must not be forgotten that Law and Equity are not merely two rival codes of jurisprudence existing side by side on equal terms. With the solitary exception that, under the influence of one great Common Law Judge, the custom of merchants has been assimilated by Courts of Law as well as by Courts of Equity, the Common Law has been destitute of growing vitality since the days of COKE. The jurisprudence of every country must grow with the needs of growing civilization, or it soon ceases to adapt itself to the wants of men. Our jurisprudence has grown during the last two centuries more vigorously than it ever grew before. Each generation has seen whole chapters of new law gradually created out of chaos, but with trifling exceptions the growth has been manifested exclusively by the gradual development of the principles of Equity, which now form the modern supplement of the mediaeval law which the Common Law Courts administer. The difference between the rival systems is not a mere matter of jurisprudence or procedure. It is of the very substance of the law as affecting rights of property and rights and obligations arising out of the contracts and enjoyments of mankind. In the instances in which Equity effects equal justice by enforcing rights and obligations unknown to the Common Law—in the matter of Trusts, Conversion, Election, Performance, Satisfaction—in dealing with the rights and liabilities of married women with reference to separate estate (a branch of Equity which has wholly grown up within the memory of living men)—in the distribution of assets—in short, in the numerous instances in which Equity practically conflicts with and controls the Law, the matter is not one of jurisdiction and procedure, but of substance; and as such alone can it be effectually dealt with if it is desired to reconcile the two conflicting systems. Add to this, that when Law and Equity differ, the principles on which justice is administered in Equity are confessedly more consonant with rational justice than those of the Common Law, and it follows that the Law ought to be adapted to the standard of Equity. The so-called fusion of Law and Equity must take place at the ex-

pense of the Law. In other words, the hard, coarse doctrines of the Law must be merged and swallowed up in the higher, broader, and more refined principles of Equity.

Does anyone imagine that we have given too exalted a description of the nature of Equity as contrasted with that of Law? We need only answer that the whole substance of what we have just said is taken from the famous letter of the Lord CHIEF JUSTICE, and that very much of it is in his own eloquent words.

These being confessedly the conditions to be dealt with, how would any rational man, if unfettered by the fear of opposition, set to work to infuse into all our tribunals the essential principles of Equity? These principles have become the sole inheritance of the Court of Chancery, for no other reason than that the ancient spirit and traditions of the Common Law Courts refused to recognize the march of civilization, and to create for themselves, or to accept at the hands of a more enlightened series of judges, the new developments of principle which the progress of society demanded in the administration of justice. The antagonism began in what the Lord CHIEF JUSTICE himself condemns as the unseemly struggle of Lord COKE and the Court of Queen's Bench against the CHANCELLOR's jurisdiction. It went on to our own times in obedience to the same spirit and the same traditions. Meanwhile the Court of Chancery grew, in spite of it, till it had developed a great system of jurisprudence, formed on large and enlightened principles, which secures for us at this day the essentials of justice according to right and reason. The spirit and traditions of the Court of Chancery are therefore, according to the highest Common Law authority, the spirit and traditions which have to be infused into all our Courts. There is one way, and one way only, in which this can be done. The spirit of a law and the tradition of a Court live in the minds of living men and are guarded by the associations connected with old institutions. You cannot transplant them if you would by Act of Parliament. The Common Law Courts cherish alike the noble traditions of order and liberty which are their just pride, and the narrow traditions of hard technical law which made the Court of Chancery a necessity, and which can only be tempered by infusing into them the higher tradition of Equity jurisprudence. While the names, the constitution, the special jurisdiction, and the *personnel* of the old Courts remain unchanged, the old traditions, good and bad alike, will, as Lord CAIRNS has justly said, still linger about them. Equity jurisdiction may be given by statute in larger measure than heretofore, but it will be used as it has been used heretofore. The spirit of Equity will be wanting in the future as it has been wanting in the past, and the old repugnance of COKE and his successors, the old traditions which prevented the Courts of Law from developing Equity for themselves, will sway the judges in their own despite. The remedy is easy if once personal considerations are postponed and personal compromises rejected. Let the judges who are the living depositaries of the principles of Equity be associated in due proportion with their brethren of the Common Law in all the Courts (as indeed is proposed in the Court of Appeal); let each division of the united Court learn to look upon itself as the heir of the Chancellors no less than of the Chief Justices, and there will be some prospect of a real assimilation of Law and Equity. But this is the very reverse of what the CHANCELLOR's Bill proposes. Old prejudices against Equity are to be preserved by concessions to sentiment, and the only Court which is to be shorn of its powers and forbidden any longer to grow is that to which we owe all the doctrines which it has become an imperative necessity to engrave upon the law.

Such a Bill may be an easy Bill to pass, but it will become an impossible Act to work. The principles of Equity will perish in an uncongenial atmosphere, and the very source from which alone they can be renovated is to be choked with restrictions on its flow. The considerations on which we have dwelt seem to us too grave to be mixed up with criticism of details, but there is much in the machinery of the Bill to which we hope to call attention at a future time. With the deepest regret we must say—Better no reform at all than a merely nominal reform. Better no Bill than such a Bill as this.

MR. HARCOURT ON PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

MR. HARCOURT'S motion for the reduction of expenditure has been rewarded by unexpected success. Mr. GLADSTONE seems to have wished for an opportunity of perfecting the control of the Treasury over the other public departments; and the Committee which is to be nominated by the Government will not fail to recommend through its official

Chairman any regulations which may approve themselves to the judgment of the PRIME MINISTER and the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER. The Report of a Select Committee of this kind sometimes furnishes a convenient though cumbersome substitute for a Ministerial explanation. In accordance with established custom, the Government is represented on the Committee by a majority, and its proposals are therefore ultimately adopted. In Mr. GOSCHEN'S Committee on Land Taxation, the Opposition members voted against the Chairman on every important question, and possibly some of the majority might have been equally recalcitrant if they had not been restrained by their party allegiance. In the end a clever and one-sided pamphlet, composed by Mr. GOSCHEN himself, was adopted as the Report of the Committee. In the following year a Ministerial Bill embodied the substance of the Ministerial Report, and the same scheme will probably be reproduced in the Local Taxation Bill of the present year. If Mr. GLADSTONE thought fit to disclose his intentions, he could at this moment anticipate the conclusions which his Committee will draw from the evidence which they will formally receive. Mr. HARCOURT or other members may perhaps propose alternative Reports, but the recommendations of the Government will be finally accepted by the Committee. The general control of the Treasury is on the whole beneficial, though in some instances it is exercised with perverse and shortsighted pedantry. The Treasury clerks who refuse grants of the necessary expenses of prosecutions cause great inconvenience to the community, but the losses which may result from their indirect encouragement of crime are not included in the Estimates. It may be doubted whether the Committee will discover any opportunity of saving money. As Mr. WHITE plaintively remarked, the last Committee of the kind only struck off a few hundreds a year, and in one instance of reduction they seem to have committed an oversight. It is the business of the Government or of the heads of departments rather than of the House of Commons to supervise the details of expenditure. The concession of a Committee on the Civil Estimates offered the Government the double advantage of facilitating the introduction of an official or administrative change, and of avoiding a troublesome and useless discussion on naval and military expenditure. Mr. HARCOURT has taken an active part in agitation for the reduction of the army, having even with remarkable courage undertaken to prove that an invasion of England is impossible. Mr. GLADSTONE, though he may perhaps have sympathized with Mr. HARCOURT's opinions, was on sufficient grounds unwilling to submit to a Committee the question of the strength and organization of the army, which ought, if Mr. AUBERON HERBERT is in the right, to be reduced to 5,000 men.

Mr. HARCOURT earned much applause by an elaborate and eloquent speech which proved absolutely nothing. In some years the total expenditure had increased, in other years it had diminished, and, on the whole, after making proper allowances and deductions, the expenditure of 1872 is about the same with that of 1862. Within that interval nearly all the conditions by which public expenditure is necessarily regulated have been fundamentally changed. Two great European wars have produced a revolution in the military establishments of all countries; and at home the Government has been required to undertake functions which necessarily involve a corresponding outlay. The Education Estimates have, through a policy which has been universally approved, increased by about a million. The mode of providing for penal and police administration has been in many cases readjusted, and the prices of all commodities have largely increased. It is of course possible that necessary additions to expenditure may have been further augmented by extravagance or carelessness; but Mr. HARCOURT's statistics suggested no reason for expecting that any reduction could be advantageously effected. If he had examined into the expenditure of any one public office, and had shown a *prima facie* case of excessive expenditure, he would have laid a solid foundation for his demand of inquiry. It may possibly be useful from time to time that Committees should inquire into the public expenditure; but if the House of Commons thinks such investigations expedient, they ought to be repeated at regular intervals.

No member of the House of Commons excels Mr. HARCOURT either in capacity to acquire special knowledge, or in the industry which is indispensable for the purpose; but it is evident that he has not yet troubled himself to master the details of finance. Among the payments which he condemned as collectively excessive was the annual sum which is invested in Terminable Annuities for the reduction of the Debt. It is sufficiently obvious that the conversion of a perpetual into a

temporary annuity must involve a larger annual payment; but, although well-founded objections may be raised to the particular process, the House of Commons has deliberately, on the proposal of successive Governments, adopted the system of commutation. Mr. LAING, in the most instructive speech of the debate, pointed out the fallacy of Mr. HARCOURT's statements of the comparative reduction of taxes in two different periods. During the inflation of trade in 1862 and 1863, and at a time when the arrears of the Chinese war had been paid off, Mr. GLADSTONE was able to take off a large amount of taxation. After the collapse of 1866 the revenue was comparatively stationary, and the process of reduction became necessarily slower. Although Mr. LOWE has intimated that there will be no considerable surplus in the ensuing year, the Government is as fully entitled to credit for the payment of the *Alabama* damages out of revenue as for any reduction of burdens which might in other circumstances have been effected. If the damages had been admitted and paid at the time when, in the opinion of the Geneva Tribunal, they were incurred, Mr. GLADSTONE would have effected smaller reductions in 1863, and Mr. LOWE would have been better able to take off taxes in 1873. The rise or fall of the revenue or of the surplus which may be applied in relief of taxation has little connexion with moderate or excessive expenditure. In prosperous as in unfavourable times, waste ought to be prevented, and the public service to be maintained in the highest state of efficiency.

The abstract question whether abstract Parliamentary resolutions are expedient is unprofitable and barren. Mr. HARCOURT was enabled to meet his critics with the triumphant answer that his abstract resolution had produced the concrete result of a Select Committee. Whether any of the objects which Mr. HARCOURT proposed to himself will be attained by the appointment of the Committee or by its investigations will appear hereafter. A private member who extorts even an unprofitable concession from the Government is like a soldier who has captured a flag. The article which he has acquired may not be intrinsically valuable, but it is a proof of victory. The Committee will be debarred from entering into inquiries as to the Debt and the Civil List, the army and the navy. It will be difficult to examine the Estimates for Education while a Government Bill for the alteration of the Education Act is pending; nor could any Committee attempt to interfere with the recent and deliberate legislation of Parliament until the results have been tested by longer experience. Two or three members naturally congratulated the House on the prospect of the services which Mr. HARCOURT might render the Committee when they inquired into the costs of legal and judiciary establishments; but while the LORD CHANCELLOR'S Bill for the reorganization of all the Superior Courts is pending it would be absurd to examine in detail a head of expenditure which must necessarily be affected by the measure. Mr. HARCOURT has sometimes proposed the suppression of the office of Revising Barrister; but the Committee will scarcely inquire into the evil of a system which by another Bill the ATTORNEY-GENERAL proposes to remodel. If the inquiry is confined to the staff and salaries of the Civil Service in general, it is not probable that any feasible reductions will be discovered. The opposite conclusion that some public servants are underpaid might possibly have recommended itself to the Committee, if Mr. GLADSTONE had not providently limited their functions to the means of reducing the expenditure. Possibly it may occur to the Civil Servants themselves that a body which may perhaps hold that they receive too much ought also to have been authorised to inquire whether they receive too little. On the whole, there can be little doubt that the only object of the Committee is to tighten the bonds of official discipline by conferring some additional power on the Treasury. Mr. HARCOURT is fully entitled to erect his trophy, but the spoils with which he will be decorated are likely to be rather ornamental than costly or saleable.

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION.

THE defects of the Irish University Bill spring directly out of one of its principal merits. It recognizes that a main function of a University is to teach; that a University which only examines students who have been taught by others may be a highly useful institution, but is still something less than a University. In Ireland, however, the foundation of a new teaching University is surrounded with special difficulties. Mr. FAWCETT and his friends will probably object that there is no need to found a new University. The existing University of Dublin is, they will say, sufficient when

once tests have been abolished to fulfil every useful purpose. The answer to this is, that whatever other purposes the existing University may serve, it will not serve the only purpose for which legislation is really required. An Irish University Bill which did not aim at enabling Roman Catholics to obtain the benefit of a University education would be as appropriate as the Irish Land Bill would have been if it had made no change in the position of the tenant farmer. As it is, Roman Catholics cannot obtain a University degree for their sons without giving up what they consider the advantage of an education associated with their own religion. Those who regard Mr. FAWCETT's Bill as an adequate settlement of the question must be prepared to maintain either that this is not a grievance or that it does not exist in Ireland. In the first case they differ from the Government on a question of principle; in the second case they differ from the Government on a question of fact. On the assumption therefore that this is a grievance if it exists, and that it does exist in Ireland, some reconstitution of the Irish University system is indispensable. On the assumption that a merely examining University cannot give a complete University education, provision for teaching must be an element in the reconstruction. The special difficulties of the situation must be faced, not passed over. The fact that there are now two Universities in Dublin, and the peculiar constitution of one of them, create one of these difficulties. It would be impossible to add a third University, and it is not easy, in remodelling one or both of the two already in being, to ignore the peculiar features which characterize the younger of them. The Queen's University is composed of colleges geographically separate. To an examining University this is no inconvenience, but to a teaching University it is a very great inconvenience. If the lectures given by the University Professors are worth anything, students who have not had the opportunity of attending them will be at a disadvantage as compared with students who have made good use of that opportunity. It will appear to some persons that if so large a deduction has to be made from the value of the new University, regarded as a teaching body, it may be as well to reduce it to the level of an Examining Board. But, beside all the educational objections to which this solution is open, there is a political objection which might be fatal to the prospects of the Bill. All the endowments of the two Queen's Colleges and the greater part of the endowments of Trinity College are to be left untouched, and none of these can be of any benefit to the class of Roman Catholics for whose case Parliament is asked to make provision. If the University of Dublin were made a mere Examining Board, while the Roman Catholic colleges were excluded from endowment on the score of their denominational character, the Roman Catholics might complain that they had no share, direct or indirect, in the money spent on the higher education in a country in which they constitute three-fourths of the population. The only way in which any such share can be extended to them is by the foundation of professorships from which no Roman Catholic need be excluded by religious scruples. That in the latest as in the earliest form of the Bill the new University will contain a teaching element may, we think, be safely predicted.

It follows from this that the difficulty about the geographical diffusion of the colleges must either be submitted to or be met by the concentration of the Queen's Colleges. Unless there is some unknown obstacle in the way of this latter course, it would decidedly be the preferable alternative. According to this plan the endowments in arts belonging to the Queen's Colleges at Belfast and Cork would be transferred to a new Queen's College at Dublin, the provincial colleges being retained, if it were thought expedient, as professional schools. The objection in the way of this arrangement would be that it would make University education more costly. At present in the two largest of the provincial cities of Ireland a student can obtain a degree without leaving his home, whereas the proposed transfer of the colleges would make it necessary for every student to reside in Dublin during the academical year. No doubt the cheapening of University education is in itself a good thing, but it must not involve a deterioration of the article supplied. It is very questionable whether the system of local colleges, having no relation to the University beyond that of supplying students for its examinations and candidates for its emoluments, does not involve such a deterioration. It may be said that, as attendance at Professors' lectures is to be voluntary, it will matter little whether a student passes his University life in Dublin or out of it. But, wherever the lectures are worth attending, they will, at all events in those subjects which enter into the University examinations, be sure to attract listeners. At Oxford and Cambridge it has been found that, even in subjects which

lie outside the ordinary course of University studies, a competent teacher has rarely any difficulty in getting a class together. Nor does the essence of University training lie exclusively in the lectures. Much of it is in the air, in the life the students lead, in the atmosphere of discussion they breathe, in the constant intellectual friction to which they are subjected. A student reading for his degree at Cork or Belfast, and mixing only with men whose antecedents and prejudices run for the most part in the same local groove with his own, will be altogether outside this subtle influence. Putting these two losses together, they amount to a very serious deduction from the value of a University education. The class of students for whom the ability to live at home while keeping terms for their degree is especially intended are the class which will be chiefly attracted by the bursaries and exhibitions to be attached to the new University. If necessary, these might be increased in number, and even in value. It is much better to enable students by judicious endowments to get a really good education than to enable them to get an inferior education without endowments. If the Presbyterians wish to maintain a College of their own in the University, there would not be much difficulty in moving the Magee College to Dublin; and the Roman Catholic institution at Carlow, which is expected to put in a claim to be included in the schedule of colleges, might be merged in the college at present known as the Catholic University. Looking at the question from a merely denominational point of view, it would certainly be wise for the Roman Catholics to concentrate all their strength in improving to the utmost a college which will have to contend in the University arena with the wealth, the experience, and the traditions of Trinity.

The two clauses relating to religion are the 11th, which empowers the Council to punish teachers or examiners who, when in discharge of their functions as University officers, give wilful offence to the religious convictions of any members of the University; and the 12th, which prohibits the University Council from appointing Professors or Teachers in Theology, Modern History, or Moral and Mental Philosophy. To the former clause it has been objected that there is no subject of human interest which may not give occasion to a teacher to offend some tender conscience, and consequently that no teacher of any merit will consent to work under such restrictions. This view of the case involves, as it seems to us, an exaggerated view of the theological thorniness of University studies. No doubt ancient history or physical science may be so treated as to give very grave offence even to consciences which are not especially tender, but, in so far as they are so treated, the offence will usually be found to lie in the extension of the teacher's views to subjects lying outside his proper sphere. A Professor of Geology does not give offence to the conscience of a believer in the Mosaic account of the Creation by setting out the evidence in favour of assigning a very high antiquity to man, or by stating his own belief in its conclusiveness. But he would be justly reprimanded under the 11th Section if he made this an excuse for telling his class that the Book of Genesis is a forgery or a fiction. No doubt, if the 12th Clause were away, the 11th Clause would be very hard to work. It would require a delicacy of handling almost superhuman to ensure that the treatment of moral and mental philosophy should never give offence to scrupulous persons of a different religion from that of the Professor. But, with this subject excluded, the difficulty of avoiding offence is much diminished. It must be remembered also that the offence is to be wilful, and that, even where it has been given, a mixed and highly representative Council will have to decide whether it was wilfully given. This seems to be of itself some security against the clause being perverted to close a teacher's mouth as regards the unfettered exposition of his own subject.

The exclusion of Philosophy and Modern History from the subjects taught by the University is open to more objection. It will, it is said, lower the value of Dublin honours by the side of those of the English Universities, and it brands the University course with an obvious note of incompleteness. It is important, however, not to overrate the importance of a flaw the existence of which cannot be denied. In the first place, an education in ancient and modern languages and history, in ancient history, in mathematics pure and mixed, and in natural science, will embrace all that is even now imparted to the most eminent Cambridge men. It is true that, in the latter case, there is a Moral Science Tripos for those who wish to be examined in philosophy. But Senior Wranglers and Senior Classics are still held both in the University and in

the world outside to be the most genuine and distinctive products of Cambridge training, and as regards both of them Dublin will be free to turn out the same or better. In the second place, the excluded subjects are excluded only from University teaching, not from college teaching. Trinity College, the Queen's College—should one be set up in Dublin, instead of those now existing in the provinces—and the denominational colleges will all be at liberty to teach philosophy in their several fashions, and in this way there may eventually be as healthy a rivalry in philosophical opinion as can possibly be desired. Readers of the *Dublin Review*, for example, will not need to be told how valuable a controversy on first principles might be looked for if Mr. MILL were to be teacher of philosophy in Trinity College and Mr. W. G. WARD in the Roman Catholic College. It is a mistake, we believe, to suppose that all Roman Catholics object to philosophical discussion, or to their sons knowing that there are philosophers who deny the freedom of the will, or who maintain that there is no essential difference between thought and digestion. What they do object to is the sending forth of these theories with the imprimatur of a University on them. In fact, their position is pretty well identical with that of Protestants who do not object to their sons knowing that the Pope is held by many persons to be infallible, but might not care to send them to lectures in which the truth of the doctrine would be assumed or maintained by the Professor. This class of scruples might perhaps be met by the expedient of a double Chair of Philosophy, which we suggested last week. As regards Modern History, we are not without hope that it may be found possible to reconsider the decree of exclusion. But, in considering this and every other provision, the point to be steadily borne in mind is that the Bill does not profess to be an ideally perfect measure, and that the true test of any criticism to which it may be subjected will be the ability of the critic to suggest anything better adapted to the peculiar circumstances which it is designed to meet.

THE END OF THE COMMITTEE OF THIRTY.

THE Committee of Thirty have from first to last been consistently inconsistent. If their one purpose in life had been to falsify public expectation, they could not have achieved this end more completely. They have been lions when everybody thought they were going to be most lamb-like. They have been lambs when they were supposed to have pledged themselves irrevocably to play the part of lions. Last week their changes of character seemed to have come to an absolute end. They had discussed and voted upon all the subjects submitted to them, and they had entrusted the Duke of BROGLIE with the task of embodying their conclusions in a final Report. In the ordinary course of business the adoption of this Report would have been a mere process of course. Parties in the Committee were not so equally balanced as to leave a chance that the death or defection of a single member might convert the minority into a majority. Two-thirds or so of the Committee had held together with admirable unanimity through all the changing scenes of the Committee's life, and the majority which had told the Duke of BROGLIE what to say in his Report was the same majority that would have to give it the seal of formal acceptance as soon as he had said what he had been told. The position which the Committee seemed at length to have taken up was sufficiently intelligible. They had abandoned the attempt to silence M. THIERS. It was plain that M. THIERS did not mean to be silenced, and the Committee had probably ascertained that on this point at all events he would have a majority in the Assembly with him. Failing in their first design, they had determined to resist at all hazards the attempt of the Government to make them instrumental in giving form and permanence to the Republic. They had refused to recommend the Assembly either to create a Second Chamber, or to pass an electoral law, or to provide for the continuance of the Executive power after its own dissolution. If the Assembly was to undertake these tasks, it would have to do so under the direct influence of M. THIERS. The Bills would be Government Bills, and in all essential respects they would be the mere expression of the PRESIDENT's wishes. The Committee were not willing to expose the Assembly to this trial. They preferred to keep the work of legislation in their own hands. Accordingly the resolution at last voted provided that the first two points should be referred to them for further consideration, and that the last point should be put aside altogether. The Committee would by and by set to work upon a Second

Chamber, and when the Electoral Bill had been prepared they would consider whether it met their views. As to the continuance of the Executive power, they would have none of it. It was not easy to say precisely who should have the management of the elections, but they found no difficulty in settling that M. THIERS should not have it.

M. DUFRAUDE's proposal was thereupon rejected, and a series of resolutions embodying these conclusions was handed to the Duke of BROGLIE as the materials from which to construct his Report. By Monday last the Duke had got through his work, and the Report was read to the Committee. With some forebodings, it may be, of what was to come later in the week, the Session was declared secret; but the *Times*' Correspondent, who usually knows what the Right knows, has told us that, though mild in form, the Report firmly maintained the conclusions of the Committee. On Tuesday morning the Report was communicated to the PRESIDENT. In the course of the day a Council of Ministers was held to consider its terms, and later in the afternoon the Duke of BROGLIE had an interview with M. THIERS. On Wednesday morning the Duke of BROGLIE appeared before the Committee a changed man, and, which is more wonderful, found that he had to deal with changed men. The discussion turned upon the possibility of coming to an agreement with the Government on the basis of a new Report upon M. DUFRAUDE's proposals. It soon appeared that, the will not being wanting, the way would not be wanting. A fresh Report was constructed at a moment's notice and sent to M. DUFRAUDE, who laid it before the Council of Ministers. It does not appear what the contents of this Report were, but they were such as to encourage the Government to suggest further modifications, which were accepted by the Committee the same afternoon. In its final shape the Report is in substance M. DUFRAUDE's rejected proposal over again. The Assembly is recommended to declare that it will not separate until it has provided for the organization and working of a Second Chamber, for a new electoral law, and for the transmission of powers, while the Government is made to promise to present laws in conformity with this declaration. There is no trace of compromise here. It is an absolute and unconditional surrender. The Government asks the Committee to adopt a certain recommendation. The Committee, after full debate, refuse to adopt it, and proceed to adopt a different one. Having done this, they next ask the Government whether there is no means of coming to an agreement with them. The Government answer, Yes, by throwing over your own proposal, and substituting ours for it. Whereupon the Committee do as they are bidden.

It is very much easier to describe this singular proceeding than to explain it. The explanation which seems to be most generally accepted connects it with the failure of the recent attempt to bring about a fusion. According to this theory, the Right at the moment of their parting company with M. THIERS were sanguine as to their chances of being able soon to do without him. If the Count of PARIS could be got to pay a visit to the Count of CHAMBORD, Royalty would be looking up in the market. The Legitimists and the Orléanists would pull together in the Assembly; the Conservative majority would become homogeneous; all good men would rally round a restoration in which the old BOURBON wine would be poured once more into a new constitutional bottle; and the wounds of France would be healed. With such prospects as these before them, it was not in human nature that they should think it worth while to keep M. THIERS in good humour. But between the preparation of the Report and its final adoption came the news that the fusion had again come to nothing. The Count of CHAMBORD and the Count of PARIS were as far apart as ever. So long as the heads of the rival branches cannot find a middle term upon which to agree, their followers must not be more ingenious. They are bound to go on weakening one another until such time as their respective chiefs give the signal for laying down their arms. In this way M. THIERS became again indispensable. With a fusion, the Monarchists would have substitutes ready in the event of his throwing up his office. The Count of CHAMBORD would take the part of Constitutional King which has been rejected by the *petit bourgeois*, and the Duke of AUDIFFRET PASQUIER would be ready to serve as First Minister. But without a fusion M. THIERS was plainly master of the field. The influences which have made him supreme in the Assembly, and still more in the country, from the day that peace was signed would still be in full force. In that case there was nothing to be done except to make their peace with him once more, and so very disagreeable a dose could not be swallowed so quickly. If this is the true account of the matter, some

more presentable excuse will have to be invented by the time that the Report of the Committee is laid before the Assembly. The form which this excuse will take will probably be that, in the interview between the Duke of BROGLIE and the PRESIDENT, the latter gave such satisfactory assurances as to the manner in which he proposed to carry on the Government, that the hostility of the Committee had been disarmed. Their paramount desire had been to obtain some security for the maintenance of Conservative principles. They had in the first instance endeavoured to arrive at this by keeping as much power as possible in the hands of the Assembly. With this view they had rejected the proposal of the Government to take the initiative in constitutional legislation, and had recommended that any projects of the kind should be submitted to the Committee for consideration. M. THIERS's frank assurance of the substantial identity of his views and wishes with those of the Committee had at the eleventh hour worked a change in their plan. They became suddenly convinced that the Conservative party had nothing to fear from him, and they had consequently given up all thought of tying his hands. It is conceivable of course that this may be the real explanation of what has happened. But, considering how wide a gulf has of late separated the PRESIDENT from the Right, it seems all but impossible that any genuine reconciliation can have been effected between them. That M. THIERS was conciliatory and diplomatic may readily be believed. That the Committee, when they found themselves really pledged to a stand-up fight with the PRESIDENT, took fright at their own boldness, may readily be believed. Out of these elements it may not have been difficult to devise a colourable pretext for surrender. This commonplace hypothesis may perhaps come nearer the truth than the theories which assign the collapse of the Committee either to despair at the failure of the fusion, or to a late conviction of the soundness of M. THIERS's policy.

THE GALWAY PROSECUTIONS.

THE Galway prosecutions have ended, as might have been expected, in the acquittal or escape of all the defendants. Those who are anxious to form an opinion on the conduct of the inculpated priests and prelates are at liberty to choose among three verdicts successively delivered by as many different tribunals. The Judge who was entrusted with the duty of investigating the validity of the Galway election unseated the sitting member on proof satisfactory to his mind that some of the Roman Catholic bishops and clergy had practised the most open and shameless intimidation. In some instances the priests had even been present when actual violence was offered to supporters of the candidate whom they had disapproved; and the Judge satisfied himself that both priests and bishops had in numerous cases threatened with spiritual penalties any elector who might resist their dictation. It was unfortunate that Justice KEOGH's indignation was too eloquently expressed; but even his most unscrupulous assailants have never ventured to dispute the substantial justice of his decision. Dublin juries have now declined to convict some of those who were denounced by the Judge as the grossest offenders; and a Roman Catholic bishop has been acquitted. If the balance of authority as to the evidence were equal, it would perhaps be inclined in favour of the earlier decision by the informal judgment of a volunteer Court of Appeal. The Dublin rabble frantically applauded the defendants, not because they regarded them as innocent, but because they believed them to have prostituted their spiritual influence to a factious purpose. One of them, in an address to the mob, instead of repudiating the infamous language of which he had been accused, boasted that his conduct had been perfectly legitimate, and that on any future occasion he would adopt the same course. There can be little doubt that he will keep a promise which may be performed without the smallest danger as a set-off against the popularity which will be incurred by a breach of the law. It is impossible to punish turbulent Irish priests except by prosecuting them before Irish juries; and the recent experiment is not assuring. If infallible personages were bound to be consistent, the POPE, in his periodical communions of Liberals and opponents of authority, would perhaps find a word of censure for priests of his own communion who rival in lawless violence the most troublesome secular demagogues. In one of his speeches Mr. BURR reproached the Government for trying the priests before a court of law, instead of leaving them to the jurisdiction of their ecclesiastical superiors. It would be as reasonable to refer a traveller who had been robbed by a highwayman to the disciplinary powers of the captain of the band.

The Government had no choice in deciding on the prosecutions after the judgment on the election petition. It is a constitutional assumption that juries will give verdicts in accordance with the evidence; and there could be no doubt that, unless Justice KEOGH had been altogether mistaken, grave offences had been committed. The result of the trials was probably foreseen from the first, but the Government could scarcely have declined to prosecute on the ground that justice was unattainable in Ireland. The trials might, as the result has shown, as well have been held in Galway, where some of the jurors would probably have been accomplices in riot and intimidation. The Irish Court of Queen's Bench held, notwithstanding the arguments of the defendants' counsel, that a local trial would be too absurd; and, by removing the cases to Dublin, they furnished the Crown and the defendants with the only chance of a fair trial which it was in their power to secure. The CHIEF JUSTICE appears to have done his utmost to confine the attention of the jury to the evidence; and the ATTORNEY-GENERAL and Serjeant ARMSTRONG have not shrunk from discharging their duty. The advocate who is charged with the vindication of order and electoral freedom must be prepared in Ireland to encounter forensic ribaldry and insult. Mr. HERON would have incurred a grave responsibility if his invective against Serjeant ARMSTRONG had excited the howling mob around the court to acts of violence. After the verdicts which have been delivered, the Government will probably abandon the remaining prosecutions. No one is bound to perform impossibilities, and there is evidently no hope that the Galway delinquents will be brought to justice. At future elections the Ballot, though it may perhaps confirm and extend the power of the priests, will in some degree rescue independent voters from personal danger. Clerical agitators will still rave and curse from their altars, and some of their disciples will yield to spiritual intimidation, but it is impossible to determine how far the fear of temporal consequences is combined with religious submission. The Irishman who only half believes that his priest can consign him to eternal perdition for giving an honest vote is fully aware that, if he defies the threat, he is in danger of more practical molestation.

In one case the jury seems to have been justified by the evidence in acquitting a defendant. The language attributed to Bishop DUGGAN was only proved by a single witness, who had, unluckily for himself, in jest or earnest, at one time tampered with the Fenian conspiracy. It is easy, even without the aid of the newspaper reports, to appreciate the opportunity which was offered to Mr. BURR of displaying his faculty of sarcasm, of abuse, and of virtuous indignation. The witness declared that the Bishop had uttered an anathema on any elector who should disobey the injunctions of himself and his clergy. In spiritual jurisprudence an anathema closely resembles the *præmuniare* of old English law, as a penalty which is rather vaguely apprehended than distinctly understood. There is no doubt that, if spiritual intimidation is forbidden by law, bishops and priests have no right to anathematize political opponents. The defendant produced ten witnesses who swore that the word anathema had never been said; and although their evidence was open to Serjeant ARMSTRONG's remark that it had not been given on the inquiry at Galway, it can scarcely be said that where a doubt must be allowed in favour of an accused person the jury were bound to prefer one witness to ten. Heretical friends of rational liberty may perhaps find some consolation in the reflection that an Irish Roman Catholic Bishop repudiates the use of menacing language, and takes issue rather on the facts of the case than on his own spiritual privileges. In the other trials the counsel for the defence endeavoured to perplex the jury by the casuistical argument that the clergy are justified in advising their flocks on the discharge of a moral duty. It is allowable to warn a man that he is walking along a path which ends in a precipice; and if the consequence of voting for Captain TRENCH was eternal perdition, a conscientious priest could hardly shrink from the duty of indicating the formidable danger. The answer to the argument is simply that a sceptical Legislature has distinctly forbidden the practice of intimidation, without regard to the possible dictates of religious duty. The jury was impanelled to try the facts according to the law; but juries, and especially Irish juries, take a liberal view of their functions. In the case of Dr. DUGGAN, Mr. BURR and Mr. HERON had the simpler task of vituperating the witness for the prosecution, and of endeavouring to satisfy the jury that their client had not used the words which they would perhaps in other circumstances have justified.

The supporters of Home Rule or separation are in the habit

of complaining that under the Imperial Government the affairs of Ireland are administered according to English doctrines under English institutions. It must be admitted that a national system which is founded on certain traditional assumptions operates strangely on a dissimilar community. Irish elections and Irish political trials by jury place a heavy strain on popular institutions. It is an anomaly that a set of factious priests should have the power of electing a member of Parliament; but among the rights of the inhabitants of the United Kingdom is the liberty of following the most mischievous guidance. The Roman Catholic clergy, who in every other European country are the advocates of absolute government, perhaps display a want of foresight when they become leaders of a disaffected and revolutionary rabble. It is at least possible that Irishmen may in course of time direct against their ecclesiastical rulers the same spirit of antagonism which they have learned to cultivate to lawful temporal authority. In the United States, where there are no landlords to denounce, the Irish Roman Catholic often regards the instructions of his priest with dangerous indifference. Rebellious or mutinous habits of mind are not favourable to the maintenance of abject intellectual submission. The most plausible defence which has been suggested for the Galway denunciations is the probable statement that the electors voted in accordance with their own wishes, although they were urged to the poll by threats of spiritual penalties. The time may come when the priests will be on the less popular side; and then they will perhaps find that the malcontents whom they have encouraged and stimulated will have courage to look an anathema in the face. For the present the Galway priests have obtained a kind of triumph; and they care little for the remote public opinion which they defy. Mr. BUTT also and his colleague have obtained a series of easy victories; they find their reward in the applause of a disaffected multitude. It will be useless to furnish them with additional opportunities of persuading willing juries.

JURIES.

THE Juries Bill is one of those odd projects of legislation which almost tempt one to a momentary belief in the doctrines of astrology. It would seem as if their existence could be accounted for only by the influence of some fatal planet which overpowered reason, common sense, and even self-interest, and compelled those who were under its baneful direction to indulge in all sorts of incomprehensible and foolish freaks. There are some practical grievances connected with the jury system which ought to be remedied, and nothing could be easier than to put an end to them. But under pretext of doing this the Government wantonly seizes the opportunity of turning everything topsy-turvy, and of proposing a general revolution of the existing system. The nearest approach to the Juries Bill as sketched out by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL would be a measure providing that henceforth all the Browns should be called SMITHS and all the SMITHS BROWNS, just for the fun of the thing, and by way of relieving the monotony of existence. Nobody asks for such a Bill; nobody wants it; nobody likes it; it is about as certain as anything can be that it will never be passed; and assuredly no credit will be gained by an attempt to pass it. Short cuts are proverbially treacherous, and the House of Commons would certainly have saved both time and trouble hereafter if, on the second reading of this extraordinary Bill, it had applied itself in earnest to a discussion of the principle or principles on which it is supposed to be founded. Unfortunately the House of Commons has of late years shown an increasing disposition to wander from the good old rule on this point. Bills are frequently read a second time *pro forma*, and then there is either a debate on going into Committee which might just as well have been taken at the previous and proper stage, or discussions on principle break out in Committee and lead to great confusion and waste of time. When the principle of a Bill has been thoroughly threshed out and settled, the details, or at least the greater part of them, are practically settled too, and may almost be left to take care of themselves. In any case the issues to be disposed of in Committee are simplified and narrowed, and some guarantee is provided for the consistency of the measure. No doubt there is sometimes a difficulty in determining exactly what is the principle of a Bill. In the present instance the preamble sets forth that it is expedient to consolidate and amend the laws relating to jurors and juries, but this can hardly be considered a principle. The principle of the Bill relates rather to the manner or direction of the amendment which is to be undertaken; and on this point the House

of Commons would seem for the present to be lost in a fog. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL has put before the House the Bill of last Session as amended by the Select Committee to which it was referred; but he intends to propose some important alterations in it. It would have been more natural and convenient if he had at once produced his own draft of the Bill in the shape in which he means to stand by it. The Bill will have to be reprinted, and until it is reprinted we shall not know precisely what it is to be. There are two ways in which the jury system might be amended. One way would be to try to remedy the practical grievances of the existing system, while making as few changes as possible in the general character of the arrangements. The other way would be to turn everything upside down, and to make as many changes as possible. The latter would seem to be the principle on which the present Bill has been, or is to be, framed, and it is a principle as to which the House of Commons would do well to come to some understanding before it plunges into the maze of Committee.

What are the crying grievances of the present jury system? That it is capriciously and corruptly administered, and presses unfairly on particular classes of people. In order to remedy these grievances, it is necessary to define with greater precision the conditions of service on juries, and to put the execution of the law into the hands of competent and trustworthy persons, acting under proper checks and supervision. This the Bill does, and, on the whole, as far as we can judge, it seems to do it in a satisfactory manner. The qualifications of jurors have been revised, and provision is made for the preparation, publication, and correction of the lists of jurors at suitable intervals. If the Bill stopped here, it would be a very useful and serviceable Bill, and it is not improbable that this is the shape in which it may finally be passed. Whether it is desirable to go any further, and to make a change in the constitution of the jury, is obviously a question which should be settled before going into Committee. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL agrees with the majority of the Select Committee in thinking that the number of jurors to be impanelled should be reduced from twelve to seven. The only ground on which this change is recommended is that it would be a relief to jurors. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL observed very truly that the great hardship of service is not so much the actual sitting in the jury-box during the trial of a cause, as the time spent by jurors kicking their heels in court, day after day, on the chance of their being wanted. It is necessary to keep a sufficient number of jurors always in attendance in order that successive juries may be impanelled without delay, and also that provision may be made for cases of illness and absences. A reduction of the number required to form a jury would therefore afford an amount of relief to the classes from whom jurors are drawn far beyond the number released from actual service in the box. While, however, it is well that the obligations of the system should be made to press as lightly as possible on the classes affected by it, it is also necessary to take care that, in giving relief to jurors, no injury is done to the interests of the community at large.

It is proposed that in civil cases, and in all criminal cases except treason, treason-felony, and murder, the number of a jury should in future be only seven. Lord COKE has observed that the law delighteth in the number twelve, which was the number of the patriarchs and apostles. But if that were all, equally good reasons might no doubt be adduced for setting up the number seven. Were there not seven lamps to the golden candlestick of the Temple, and seven trumpets sounded seven times round Jericho, and are there not seven days in the week? There is, as the ATTORNEY-GENERAL said, no magic in twelve, but it has at least one strong practical recommendation at the present day; and that is, that it is a number to which everybody is accustomed, and which has acquired a kind of semi-sanctity through use and wont. The nation has been brought up in the faith of twelve, and that is in itself a very good reason for sticking to it. For centuries Englishmen have been in the habit of believing that the opinion of twelve men on any question of fact might safely be accepted as a sound and trustworthy conclusion, and a new-fangled number would not command the same respect. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL could give no better reason for adhering to the old number in cases of treason and murder, while adopting seven in other cases, than a deep-rooted feeling that the sanctity of life required to be guarded in this way; but sentimental considerations of this kind supply an equally strong argument against making any change in other cases. Even supposing that we had for the first time to decide what

is the proper number for a jury, there would be a great deal to be said in favour of twelve. What is wanted is to fill the jury-box with a fair sample of ordinary human nature, and the chances are that the majority of a jury of twelve will be more likely to answer this description than the majority of a smaller body. As you lower the number the greater is the risk of getting an accidental preponderance of crotchety, prejudiced, or eccentric persons. On the other hand, there would be a practical inconvenience in going above twelve. A larger number could not conveniently take counsel together, and there might be some difficulty as to providing accommodation for them. The opinions of practical lawyers appear to be decidedly adverse to the proposed change; and, even if any change were desirable, from twelve to seven would be a rash leap to take all at once.

The most serious, as it is also the most wanton, unnecessary, and inconsiderate, of the changes now proposed is that the unanimity of the jury should be dispensed with, and that the majority should be allowed to vote a verdict. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL denounces the existing law in this respect as barbarous, but to us it seems to be not unreasonable. The advantages of the rule are obvious. It compels a jury, if any differences arise, to go over them carefully, to discuss them, and to reconsider the whole case in their minds. If the vote of a majority would settle the matter, the vote could be taken with a light heart, and the minority, instead of standing up for their opinion, would throw all the responsibility on the other side, and go off with an easy conscience. Yet minorities are often right. It is true that the Judges have power to lock up jurors who disagree, without meat, drink, fire, or candle, and, as the old law books say, to carry them about the circuit from town to town in a cart. Practically of course what happens is that, if a jury, after being locked up for an hour or two, cannot agree, it is discharged. It is easy to make fun of starving juries into unanimity, but in practice the system, as enforced mildly and discreetly by the Judges, works very well. It is at least a protest against hasty and careless verdicts, and obliges juries to act deliberately. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL asks why one pertinacious, wrong-headed, cantankerous man should be able to veto the reasonable conclusion of the rest of the jury; but a system of this kind cannot be fairly tested by exceptional failures. Not only a single juror, but sometimes a whole jury, is wrong-headed and unreasonable; yet this has never been held to be a sufficient argument for abolishing trial by jury. It is a question of the balance of advantages and disadvantages, and, on the whole, trial by jury and unanimous verdicts have the best of it when tested in this way. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL differs from the Select Committee in regard to the question of unanimity, and also in regard to the advantage of having mixed juries of common and special jurors. In favour of the mixed system Sir J. COLEBRIDGE can cite the recommendation of the Common Law Commissioners, and the more recent Judicature Commission. The danger is lest class jealousies and divisions should influence the different orders of jurors; but the experiment is said to have been tried in various parts of the country, and with satisfactory results. The provision enabling criminal cases to be tried by special juries is useful and important. There is one point upon which the Bill seems to be very inadequate, and that is as to the remuneration of jurors. Nothing can be more monstrous than the way in which poor common jurors in country districts are kept hanging about an assize town for days together in order to try causes at eight-pence a piece. They have to pay their fares to the town, to pay their expenses there, and all the while their shops or farms are perhaps left to take care of themselves. The Bill proposes that common jurors should receive two shillings, and special jurors a pound, for each cause; but a cause may last over several days, and it is clear that, as far as common jurors are concerned, an allowance of this kind is a mockery of remuneration. It was, we believe, the opinion of the late Mr. Justice WILLES that jurors, who are judges of facts, should be paid by the State as well as the judges of law; but, even if they were paid by the suitors, as at present, it would add very little to the costs of litigation to pay them properly.

MR. FORTESCUE'S RAILWAY BILL.

MR. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE'S Bill for appointing a Railway Commission or Tribunal is a necessary consequence of the Report of the Joint Committee on Railway Amalgamation. The provisions of the Bill will require the most careful consideration, but the general principle is pro-

bably sound in itself, and it is supported by high authority. The Joint Committee proved its good sense by confining itself, with two or three exceptions, to negative conclusions. The nostrums which were submitted to its approval by private or official theorists were successively rejected. The reduction of rates is not to be enforced as a necessary condition of amalgamation, at a time when the Railway Companies are suffering from a great increase in their working expenses. The absurd demand for equal mileage rates failed to approve itself to the judgment of the Committee, nor was any value attached to the wild statistics and arbitrary speculations which were adduced in support of the project of a transfer of railways to the State. Captain TYLER assured the Committee that the profit which would accrue from the annexation of the railway system would cover the interest on the National Debt. It happens that the whole value of the goods traffic in the country is almost exactly equal to the interest on the Debt. It may therefore be said that Captain TYLER undertakes to carry the goods traffic for nothing, inasmuch as the profit which he may anticipate from passenger traffic would certainly not pay interest on the purchase money of the railways. The proposal of referring all Amalgamation Bills to a Joint Committee is of doubtful expediency. It seems an anomaly that the most important measures should be exempted from the liability to a second investigation which attaches to ordinary Bills. It is doubtful whether the new Railway Board will enjoy any special facilities for determining questions of amalgamation between railways and canals, but it will be better qualified than the Court of Common Pleas to provide for the removal of vexatious obstructions to traffic. Experience alone can show whether it will be possible for any extraneous authority to compel Companies to time their trains in connexion with the trains of their neighbours and competitors; but the principle was affirmed in the Act of 1854, and the experiment of enforcing the liability of the Companies may fairly be tried.

The Joint Committee proposed that the Tribunal should undertake the settlement of all differences between Railway and Canal Companies which are, under the provisions of general or private Acts, now submitted to arbitration. The arrangement would probably be beneficial if it would work, for the delay and expense which result from frequent adjournments of arbitrations would be avoided; but it is not certain that any single body of arbitrators would be able to dispose of the whole mass of business. The proceedings themselves can scarcely be accelerated, as inquiries before arbitrators almost always involve a complicated mass of details. Under the provisions of the Bill, which in this instance departs from the recommendations of the Joint Committee, the reference to the Tribunal will only be made on the application of the parties, who in many cases will probably prefer arbitrators of their own selection. The terms on which running powers are to be exercised, the mode of fixing through rates, and the extent of facilities to be afforded are, under the provisions of various Acts of Parliament, to be settled in case of difference by arbitration. It fortunately happens that in the majority of cases the parties render litigation unnecessary by coming to an understanding; but the arrangement of similar details and the construction of ambiguous agreements will furnish the Tribunal with ample occupation. There is some novelty in proposing that a Court shall be established for the determination of a limited class of issues of fact, and for the interpretation of certain special documents. The members of the body, unless they have had previous experience of railway arbitrations, will be compelled to ascertain by inquiry from experts some of the ordinary rules of practice. Thus, according to ordinary custom, the payment for the exercise of running powers is so arranged as to leave no margin of profit to the running Company, except from the additional traffic which may be brought over its proper system. The difficulty, if any, will only occur at the commencement of the new system; and if it is found that inquiries become more tedious or more expensive, it will be easy to return to the present form of arbitration. The chief reason for investing the new Board with quasi-judicial functions was perhaps the desire of providing it with sufficient employment. It is impossible to foresee the extent of the duties which will be imposed on the Tribunal or Commission by the operation of the Bill.

The Government agrees with the Joint Committee that the Board ought to have the power of compelling in all cases the establishment of through rates between contiguous railways. Mr. FORTESCUE intimates that in the majority of cases the division of the rates will be regulated by mileage; but the Board will have power to modify the rule in consideration of

special circumstances. At present Railway Companies as a general rule make through rates with their neighbours to all non-competitive stations; and it is evidently for the interest of a Company owning part of a route to encourage to the best of its ability the transmission of traffic for the entire distance. No compulsion is necessary to ensure that the North-Eastern Company will assist the London passenger traffic of the Great Northern, or to facilitate the exchange of goods between any part of its system and the Midland district. On the other hand, competing lines are in every possible way favoured by their owners with the aid of their allies; nor is it probable that any Board or other authority will succeed in compelling Companies to extend to their rivals in trade exactly the same facilities which they provide for themselves. Under some modern Acts of Parliament competing Companies have a right to facilities as large as it will be possible for any Board to provide or to enforce; but the Company which first takes hold of traffic seldom lets it afterwards pass out of its hands as long as it passes through its district. It would be at the same time unjust and useless to require any Company to send any description of traffic either by the shortest route, or even by the route which might seem to a bystander the most convenient. As the rate is always regulated by the length of the shortest route, it matters nothing to freighters whether their goods are sent by a circuitous line, provided they arrive in time for the market to which they are despatched. Passengers may be trusted to select the better and the quicker of two competing routes. In the majority of cases it is greatly for the public interest that two or more routes should be kept open, although one may be far longer than another. Vast sums have been spent in the construction of competing lines which would often become useless or burdensome to their owners if they were compelled to hand over to their competitors a portion of the traffic which they convey. The numerous competing lines of this Session and the last are of course designed exclusively for the benefit of their promoters; but those schemes which have been or will be recognized by Parliament as legitimate undertakings may be supposed also to produce great public benefit. If a Company which proposes to construct a branch across some rival line could be compelled to hand over its traffic to its competitor at the junction, the branch would never be made. With through rates uniformly enforced might perhaps seriously injure railway enterprise.

The Joint Committee, and Mr. CHICHESTER FORTESCUE as its Chairman, had ample opportunities of ascertaining, not only that previous attempts to legislate for railways have proved abortive, but also that the failure of the various projects was fortunate. Additional experience has probably diminished the difficulties of legislation, but Parliament and the Tribunal which it is about to constitute ought to proceed with the utmost caution. Notwithstanding recent commercial prosperity, the railways of this kingdom as a whole scarcely realize any trade profit, after paying interest on the capital expended. A dividend of four or five per cent. represents only interest on capital, and leaves no margin as a remuneration for labour and for risk. If railways were constructed and worked by single capitalists, the moderate or insufficient amount of their returns would be generally recognized. The subdivision into shares held by dormant partners, though it makes no real difference in the character of the enterprise, produces the illusion that dividends are analogous rather to interest than to profit. The recent increase in the cost of labour, of stores, and of coal has eaten up the gains which would otherwise have been realized by the great increase of traffic; and there is much reason to fear that the same causes will soon seriously affect the general industry of the country. Injudicious interference might inflict serious damage on railway proprietors; and it is obviously impossible to compel Companies to carry traffic at a loss. One serious difficulty which will meet the Board at the outset of its proceedings will be caused by the numerous and complicated agreements which are equivalent to treaties among Companies, resulting from diplomatic negotiations, and sometimes from trials of strength. Many, and perhaps most of the agreements, have a Parliamentary sanction which places them beyond the reach of any revising authority. Difficulties of this kind are not necessarily insuperable, but they will deprive Mr. FORTESCUE's legislative experiment of the simplicity which might perhaps have been in itself desirable.

MAN AND WIFE (LIMITED).

ALL that is wanted to complete the Married Women's Property Bill which was read a second time in the House of Commons on Wednesday would seem to be a clause requiring married couples to register themselves under the Limited Liability Act, and to paint up on the doors of their houses in conspicuous letters a statement of their respective possessions for the information of tradesmen and other persons with whom they may be desirous of entering into business transactions. Perhaps some little alteration will also have to be made in the marriage service, so that it should not jar on the feelings of ladies who are about to enjoy the advantage of the new doctrine of matrimonial responsibilities. The "for worse" had better be omitted. Hitherto man and wife have been held to be one, with interests in common, and sharing the same fortune. But, now it seems, we are going to change all that. One of the advocates of Mr. HINDE PALMER's Bill said it would be a good thing to have the law based on a simple consistent principle. We have certainly no fault to find with the measure on that account. It is as simple and consistent as could be desired. The value of consistent and uncompromising adherence to a principle depends, however, somewhat on whether the principle is good or bad. The Bill provides that a married woman shall be capable of holding property and of contracting precisely as if she were unmarried. She may acquire property, or give it away, or go into trade or speculation, just as if she were a single woman, with nobody to think of except herself. She may sue or be sued without the slightest reference to her husband, who will henceforth cease to exercise any legal control over her actions. Her earnings, like her other property, will be absolutely her own. Under the new law, there will apparently be nothing to prevent married couples from living together in the same house, if they choose to do so, but they will be in the position of independent lodgers. The wife will be responsible for her husband's debts only in so far as she allows him to act as her agent, and the husband's liability for his wife will be put on the same footing. When the tradespeople come round to collect their accounts, they will no doubt find the investigation of the exact circumstances under which furniture, coals, joints of meat, or haberdashery, were ordered extremely entertaining. They will have the satisfaction of knowing that they are at liberty to sue the wife, as surety for her husband, if it can be shown that she gave her orders as his agent; but this satisfaction may be diminished by the discovery that unfortunately the lady has no assets. The solution of these domestic mysteries will no doubt present an amusing resemblance to the well-known game of the pea under the thimble. Artists in swindling will derive great encouragement from the change in the law, and a variety of new branches of this line of business may be expected to spring up. When a Bill very similar to this one was before the House of Lords, Lord PENZANCE observed that, if it passed, it might be doubtful how far there would remain any inducement to the male portion of the community to enter into so perilous a contract as matrimony would then become. For an honest man who was prepared to stand by his wife, and to make good her debts as if they were his own, the prospect would certainly not be very encouraging; but a rogue with a taste for safe and easy cheating might find marriage a lucrative profession. All he would have to do would be to make over his money to his wife, and testify his devotion to her by continually presenting her with costly gifts obtained from confiding tradesmen, at whom, as he would take care to have no funds of his own, he could snap his fingers.

Nobody who is acquainted with the peculiarities of the Women's Rights people will be surprised to learn that children are too trifling and insignificant a detail of matrimony to be worthy of the notice of a superior mind. It has not been thought necessary to make any provision for the maintenance of offspring. This, we suppose, will be left to chance or charity. It is interesting to observe what will be the practical operation of this remarkable piece of legislation. The wife may either go into business with her husband, or, if she likes, she may start a rival shop and carry off his customers. If she provides the greater part of the capital, she will no doubt claim priority in the firm, and "SMITH and HUSBAND" may possibly become a familiar sign. A lady who finds the dull routine of domestic duties wearisome will be at liberty to seek excitement on the Stock Exchange, or to go shares with cousin CHARLEY in a racing stable. If the family accounts get into confusion, husband and wife will have the opportunity of bringing actions against each other. Each will of course have a separate banker and solicitor. It is said that this Bill will do for all women only what is already done for those who are

in good circumstances by settlements and the Court of Chancery. In point of fact, this is very far from being an accurate statement of the case; but, even if it were, it may be doubted whether the system of settlements has been found to be so admirable that it should be made universal. Settlements are sometimes the cause of a vast deal of mischief, and operate in a very different way from that which was originally contemplated. But at least they are a purely voluntary agreement, the terms of which may be adapted to particular cases, not a rigid and absolute rule imposed without qualification or exception on every class of the community. What the Court of Chancery will do only on cause shown and in certain cases is by the Bill to be made a universal law. Everybody is agreed that some provision should be made for the protection of the property of women who have the misfortune to be married to dissipated or rapacious men. But this is the case only of a section, and we should say of a very small section, of the community, and the great body of people, who do not happen to be in this unhappy position, have also some right to be considered in the matter. If the effect of a Bill of this kind will be, as Lord PENZANCE said, to subvert the principles on which the marriage relation has hitherto stood, and to cause increased discord and separation among married people, it is important to consider who, on the other hand, will be benefited by it. It is obvious that it will be of no service to married women who have no property. Neither will it be of service to married women who possess property, but who are either protected by settlements or married to husbands who are not rapacious and dissipated. How many women, then, are there who, having both property and bad husbands, are in a position to require the protection of the law? They are a mere handful in the midst of the nation, and it might surely be possible to find some means of protecting them without converting marriage into a mere commercial partnership with limited liability. The objection to Mr. PALMER's Bill is that it goes far beyond the necessities of the case, and does a great wrong in order to do a little right.

It seems to be forgotten by the advocates of this sweeping change in the law that marriage is a transaction in which other people are concerned besides the particular married couples. If it were only a question of a man and wife arranging their private money matters between themselves, a plausible case might possibly be made out for enabling the latter to deal with her husband on an independent footing. But there is the world outside, which has also an interest in the matter. Hitherto it has been understood that a married couple represented a single household, and that the husband was responsible for its engagements. To some extent this principle is qualified by the operation of settlements, and it is notorious enough that a vast amount of dishonesty is continually practised under cover of such arrangements. But, as a general rule, husband and wife are at present, as far as the outer world is concerned, practically one, and the joint property of the household is a guarantee for any debts that may be contracted. If this bill passes it will be impossible to ascertain which of the two is responsible for the liabilities of the household. How is a tradesman to know whether in a particular instance a husband is giving orders on his own account or as his wife's agent? And people who wish to take a dishonest advantage of this state of things may be trusted to arrange that, if it is the husband who gives the orders and is liable to be sued, it will be the wife who holds the money-box. If it were the general rule in this country that women brought money to their husbands, there might be something to be said for such a protection. But this is not the general rule, and among the classes where the practice does prevail it is already provided for by settlements. In the great majority of marriages the wife has no property whatever, or only a trifle not worth mentioning—a little purse that goes in the first year's dresses. We are thus threatened with legislation to be forced upon the whole community which applies only to the circumstances of a small minority. The Bill proposes that no husband shall be liable to damages for any wrong committed by his wife. If his wife has property, she can be sued; but if she has none, the injured person will have no redress whatever. In the course of the debate the remark of a "clever woman," that by the law of England husband and wife were one person, and that person was the husband, was quoted as if such a statement of the law at once proved its injustice and absurdity. We are ready to accept the description as literally accurate, and to maintain that it is the description of a common-sense and necessary rule. It is an old saying that when two people ride a horse one must ride behind; and in a partnership one partner must have a casting vote, unless there is to be an

opening for separation in case of a difference of opinion. Divorce for incompatibility is the natural corollary of that disruption of the marriage tie in its old sense which is now contemplated. For our own part we do not believe that any legislation will practically make very much difference in the relative position of the sexes, because that position depends upon solid and substantial grounds which will continue to exist. It is well known that there is no more common cause of violence and cruelty by the husband than the possession by the wife of some little money which she has a legal right to keep from him. The best security that women can have is to be a little more cautious as to the character of the men they marry before they commit themselves to their care. In the nature of things, while the world remains as at present, men will be tolerably certain to have the upper hand in domestic rule, simply because they are stronger and more resolute, and because as a rule the support of the family mainly depends on them. But it does not follow that an increased amount of mischief and misery may not be done by rash and reckless attempts to tamper with the unity and sanctity of marriage.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF LOVE.

IN the last instalment of Mr. Herbert Spencer's exposition of the philosophical system which is to give us an explanation—so far as an explanation can be given—of the whole universe, we meet with an interesting passage upon the passion of love. The advocates of the evolution hypothesis are sometimes called materialists. That word is too often used, as "atheist" is used in theological, or a good round oath in popular discussion, simply to indicate disagreement coupled with moral disapproval. The fallacy which it involves in this case might be easily exhibited. The genuine materialists of the last century were in fact given to maintaining that our loftiest sentiments were merely modifications of the most earthly instincts.

Lust through some certain strainers well refined
Is gentle love,

according to Pope; and some very equivocal sermons have been preached upon his text. Superficial readers have fancied that, because Mr. Darwin or Mr. Herbert Spencer believes that man has been evolved by inconceivably minute changes from some inferior organism, therefore our emotions and thoughts are nothing but transformations of the blind sensations of the lowest forms of life. The misconception is palpable. Science might conceivably show under what conditions intellect first manifested itself, but it would not be one step the nearer to discovering what was the essence of intellect. It might explain the how, but can throw no light upon the what. Thus we find that Mr. Herbert Spencer's description of the passion called love has nothing in it calculated to shock the most spiritual philosopher. It is, he says, an emotion of the highest complexity, and consequently of the greatest strength. Around the purely physical elements gather all varieties of powerful emotions which blend and unite in the closest harmony. First come all the impressions which are produced by the beautiful, the explanation of which would involve a long and most difficult analysis. Then we have the sentiment of affection, which may exist between persons of the same sex, but which undergoes a special exaltation when existing between lovers. Next come the sentiments of admiration or reverence; and, beyond them again, the love of approbation, which is keenly excited by the knowledge that we are preferred to all the world, and preferred by one whom we admire beyond all others. Allied to this is the sentiment of self-approval, when we are flattered by the sense of the great merits to which we owe so great a triumph. Beyond this is the "proprietary feeling," or the pleasure of mutual possession. And, finally, there is an exaltation of the sympathies when our pleasures are heightened by the close participation of another person in all our enjoyments. We need not inquire whether the analysis is complete or accurate; at any rate it illustrates pretty fairly the amazing complexity of a passion which we are apt to describe as simple. When a young gentleman at a ball sees the young lady who is above all other young ladies enter the room, he is conscious only of a keen thrill of emotion, so vivid and powerful as to displace every other sentiment for the time. If Mr. Herbert Spencer were standing by him, and were to propose to give him a lecture on the constituent elements of his passion, we fear, though we mean no disrespect to Mr. Spencer, that he would consider the philosopher to be a bore. But perhaps a few years afterwards, or possibly on the next day if his suit should have come to an untimely catastrophe, he might be inclined to take his passion to pieces, and he would recognize the justice of most of the remarks which we have summarized. In that case he would perhaps find the explanation of some phenomena which are a little puzzling to bystanders, though the lover himself has not the leisure to attend to them.

Thus, for example, everybody is puzzled by the extraordinary caprices of love-making. The ladies who say in novels that they cannot understand "what he could see in her" are generally held up to ridicule as obviously blinded by jealousy. And yet their want of perception is not only sincere, but is shared by perfectly impartial spectators. When we see the way in which marriages are brought about in the world, we wonder that the pursuit of match-making should be found so interesting by amiable persons.

Of course match-making as a variety of fortune-hunting is only too intelligible; but there is a match-making of a much less sordid variety. All amiable women take the keenest delight in attempting to pair off their friends and relations according to their own views of the fitness of things. And yet they are always meeting with the strangest and, at first sight, the most unaccountable disappointments. The man of intellect has an extraordinary taste for stupid women; the handsome man of fashion is carried off by a poor, ugly, and commonplace woman ten years older than himself; the pompous prig secures the brightest and liveliest of her sex; foxhunters attract poetesses, and poets marry wives who can do nothing but mend their shirts. Such strange contrasts have led to the development of the plausible theory that people are attracted rather by qualities complementary than by qualities similar to their own. This doctrine, however, fails by being too comprehensive. We must admit that like often attracts like; and if we add that like also attracts unlike, we have a theory which explains nothing, because it explains everything. Every match that ever was or ever will be made may be brought under one category or the other; but until we can give some reason for telling beforehand which set of causes is likely to be operative in a given case, we are no nearer an explanation than we were before. The only general rule at which we have been enabled to arrive by experience is the rather discouraging one that people whom we like always marry people whom we dislike. Friends seem to have a perverse delight in forming new combinations which may be as discordant as possible with their ancient ties. We do not, however, see our way to erecting any philosophical theory upon this experience, unless as it goes to illustrate Artemus Ward's doctrine of the "cussedness" of things in general.

Mr. Herbert Spencer's analysis may perhaps help us to understand some of the conditions of the problem, though the philosopher has yet to arise who will be able to tell us from the inspection of a young lady or gentleman what will be the character of his or her future partner. In the first place, it is to be remarked that some of the elements which he describes do not enter into the passion in many cases, or at least do not enter into its earlier stages. Self-esteem, for example, is the reward of successful love-making, and strengthens the passion when it has once been formed; but it cannot be the primary cause. Mere contiguity is very often a sufficient explanation of the phenomenon. A man and woman brought together in Robinson Crusoe's island would almost inevitably fall in love, however unpromising their characters might be. And, though London is very unlike a desert island, there are frequently situations, even in the most crowded societies, where conditions substantially similar are reproduced. There are circumstances under which it would be almost a breach of good manners not to indulge in a little flirtation. A human being has such a variety of strong feelings in a state of solution that any object will be sufficient to determine their crystallization. This is, indeed, the primary axiom on the subject. We have all a vast amount of disposable emotion; we all long to admire and to be admired; we are grateful for compliments; we wish to have something to call our own; we want our sentiments to be confirmed by sympathy; and therefore, when once any accident has, so to speak, drawn the sluices, a whole torrent of emotion rushes into the channel provided for it, and we attribute to the one external and assignable cause what really results from our own states of feeling. Because a particular match has exploded the magazine, we absurdly argue that no other match would have done equally well. We set up the first idol that comes to hand, and suppose that its perfections are the sole cause of our worship, when, in fact, the desire to worship something has prepared us to prostrate ourselves before any shrine that offers itself. Love being a compound of so many forces, any one which is set in action draws all the rest after it by the principle of association. But all this does not answer the question as to how our choice is first determined. A young gentleman in London may see some hundreds of young ladies before he is brought down by one who is perhaps amongst the least apparently attractive of the whole number. That is the puzzle which is constantly recurring; and a solution of it would be of immense value to all match-makers, whether of the loftier or the baser variety. What is the most promising method of attack? Which of all the causes that may precipitate the passion is the most generally available? If philosophers could tell us that, they would have taken the first step towards placing an occupation, now pursued on purely empirical principles, upon true scientific grounds.

To such a question we can of course give no satisfactory answer. It may be observed, however, that it has been very much obscured by the labours of novelists. Novels are supposed to be the embodiment of the authors' knowledge of human nature; a supposition to which there is the trifling objection that very few novelists know anything of human nature, and that at most they are familiar with particular instances and not with general principles. They of course go upon the general assumption that their hero and heroine are to be as attractive as possible; and they lay particular stress upon the merit most easily described—that of personal beauty. *Jane Eyre* for a time set the fashion of ugly heroines, but we have long since reverted to the old system. Accordingly an exaggerated estimate is placed upon the charms of beauty and upon the amiable qualities of mind and person which form part of the ordinary ideal of feminine merit. The error involved in this doctrine is that it lays far too much stress on the objective as distinguished from the subjective causes of falling in

love. It assumes that the passion is determined by the external rather than by the internal impulses; that a person falls in love because an attractive object is presented to him or her, and not because he or she is prepared for a passion of some kind. When the true principle is firmly grasped, it is obvious that the most successful match-makers must be those who adopt a different line of attack. Amongst the passions, for example, which go to form the aggregate is the desire for sympathy. Suppose, then, that a young gentleman has a taste for political economy or pigeon-shooting. He may be assailed more effectively by a plain young woman who will submit to hear him lecturing on the theory of rent and the incidence of taxation, or who will applaud his successful slaughter of birds, than by the most beautiful girl who will not condescend to take an interest in his pursuits. The great art of flattery provides the most efficient instruments for bringing down game of this kind. A clever man often prefers a fool to a clever woman, because the fool has the one talent of listening, and the clever woman may have the vanity to keep opinions of her own. The brilliant man of fashion is attracted by the apparently uninteresting old maid, because nothing is more flattering than that humbug adoration which other women are too proud to bestow. Almost all cases of perverse matches may be explained after the event by the skill or the accidental felicity with which a commerce of reciprocal flattery has been established. Once put two people in that relation, and all the associated emotions may easily be introduced. It is as easy to produce an aesthetic admiration by working upon the desire for sympathy as to proceed in the inverse method; and the assumption that we should always begin with what is supposed to be the natural beginning is the cause of half our perplexities. But though these seem to be the first principles of the science, we admit that its complexity baffles all attempts at a systematic deduction of its remoter doctrines. Luckily or otherwise, some people have developed so much practical skill in applying the most efficient methods that a philosophy of the art seems to be superfluous as well as chimerical.

MR. CAMPBELL'S ADMINISTRATION OF BENGAL.

WE have before us the first part of Mr. George Campbell's "Report on the Administration of Bengal, 1871-72." It contains a great deal of valuable information, and deserves to be carefully studied by all who are interested in Indian affairs. Two years ago Mr. Campbell, then a member of the Bengal Civil Service, was nominated to the Lieutenant-Governorship of Bengal, in succession to Sir William Grey, whose term of office had not quite expired. Mr. Campbell was at the time in England, where he had passed three years in studying English politics, in offering himself as a candidate for election to Parliament, and in writing a pamphlet which not a little contributed to the settlement of the Irish land question. The selection of Mr. Campbell was due to Lord Mayo, who had never seen him, and only knew his nominee as a public servant of varied experience and original views. Many able Indian rulers pass through the Secretariat and the Imperial Council to the posts of governors of provinces, and make up for want of minute knowledge of details by breadth of imperial views. Mr. Campbell's early training was different. He had served in districts in the North-West Provinces and the Punjab. He was chosen by Lord Canning in 1858 to be the head of Law and Police in the province of Oudh, still smouldering with the embers of the mutiny. He sat for four years in the newly formed High Court of Calcutta, as one of the colleagues of Sir Barnes Peacock, and thus gained a considerable insight into the questions there argued as to the powers of landholders, the exact position of middlemen, and the rights of occupants and tenants. He was head of the Commission appointed to provide some remedy against the recurrence of such disasters as the famine in Orissa. And for a few months he held the post of Chief Commissioner of the Central Provinces. In Anglo-Indian circles he has been long noted for skill in controversy and for the command of a vigorous and incisive style; and his work *Modern India*, published in 1853, at the last renewal of the Company's charter, is still known as compressing into one volume the greatest amount of accurate information regarding the whole system of British government. It must then be conceded that, although not regularly trained to understand the Bengali character, or to speak the Bengali language, the new Lieutenant-Governor brought to his task a wide range of official knowledge, acquired during a service of more than a quarter of a century, in which he had given abundant proofs of independence and honesty of purpose.

The kingdom over which he was set as a ruler comprises the three great provinces of Bengal, Behar, and Orissa, besides Assam and some tributary and protected States. It is one of the oldest, as well as one of the richest, of our acquisitions. Its revenue has been usually estimated at fourteen or fifteen millions of our money. But, taking imperial and all provincial receipts together, we derive from it, in reality, a sum of nearly eighteen millions a year. In the same way the population was roughly estimated as at between forty or fifty millions. The recent census gives a return of sixty-seven millions, of which sixty-five inhabit districts directly administered by our own officials. The climate of the larger part of this tract, speaking generally, is divided between three months of cold, four months of hot, and five months of rainy weather. Macaulay, in his picturesque and gorgeous phrases, has told us of the rich mould

formed by the hundred channels of the Ganges, of the inexhaustible supply of fish caught in the network of its rivers, of the sugar, the salt, and the spices, and of the "immense rice harvests," which were never gathered securely into garners until "the Children of the Sea" protected the inhabitants from the raids of the Marattas. All this and even more is true. The plains of Bengal and Behar appear to produce almost anything, from rice, the daily food of some forty millions, and coarse cereals and pulses, the food of twenty more, to indigo, which takes the highest rank in London competition, and to jute, opium, saltpetre, and tea. Then, in certain localities, there are forests of timber not yet exhausted by the reckless treatment of Asiatics; and, although walled towns are unknown, and historical cities are few, there are villages by tens of thousands which, on the edges of inundated rice fields, are embosomed in magnificent breadths of productive fruit trees and feathered palms. The rainfall is abundant, and varies from about 100 inches in the Eastern districts to 60 or 65 in the West. A fair average is from 75 to 80 inches in the year, the larger portion of which falls between June and October. An endless traffic is daily carried on over the whole of these three provinces, in one mode or other; either by a natural water communication which rivals the canals of Holland, or by roads not yet quite sufficient to meet the requirements of the country, or by two railways, one of which bisects a populous division and connects the Hooghly with the Eastern Ganges and its tributaries, while the other links Calcutta to Bombay, and to all the places which in Upper India have an interest for the politician, the pilgrim, or the merchant. English enterprise and energy have in Bengal found ample scope. No one now questions the propriety of opening up rich Indian fields to an overcrowded community in England, or refuses to welcome Englishmen at factories, country houses, and marts in the interior, as guarantees for the exposure of abuses in times of peace, and as rallying points for loyalty in seasons of peril. But this fact certainly increases rather than lessens the difficulty of governing Bengal impartially and firmly, and the ruler is weighted additionally with the task of managing the port and city of Calcutta, which are little kingdoms in themselves. The national character of the population is alternately a source of weakness and a source of strength. Macaulay doubted if a hundred genuine Bengalees could be found in the British army. It would be strictly correct to say that no Bengalee was ever yet turned into a sepoy, though, of late, attempts have been made to drill and discipline the native police of Bengal. On the other hand, no province in India, for its extent and population, is held so minute a military force. It has none of those huge cantonments where there is always something wrong about the barracks, where the Brigadier and the General in command of a division are of more social importance than judges and collectors, where idle subalterns envy their companions who are "on leave at the Hills," and where privates are driven to get up *Box and Cox* as a relief from sheer monotony. On the whole, it may be said that, though educated Bengalees are somewhat pretentious, the native press carping, and the masses weak, no part of India contains less of the elements of political combustion or more of loyal submission than the plains of the Lower Ganges. We admit that there is reason to watch a local sect of Mahomedans, known as the Ferazees, and that we have now seen the population roused from inactivity to vehement self-assertion in defence of its invaded rights and privileges. But controversies between landlord and tenant, Englishman and native, usurer and borrower, manufacturer and cultivator of indigo, if not settled for ever, are now thoroughly understood, and are less cause for anxiety than our own strikes. In civil administration, when duly stimulated and controlled, Bengalees have rendered valuable service. As policemen they are active and successful; as accountants unrivalled; their penmanship would do credit to a writing master; the Hindoos amongst them have appropriated the whole trade of banking and money lending; and they possess a natural aptitude for legal argument, which, though occasionally leading them into hair-splitting subtleties, has turned out some advocates and judges of no ordinary merit. Other provinces of India have their special difficulties, advantages, and merits. One has a war-like but manly and industrious population. Another boasts an unrivalled natural harbour. A third is favoured by a less enervating or a more bracing climate. A fourth can be governed by a more simple procedure or a strictly paternal discipline. A fifth is conspicuous in the political panorama from its proximity to wild tribes or its geographical situation as the boundary of the Empire. But no province has so large and orderly a population, such a magnificent revenue, such a long official history, and, as a consequence, so many administrative problems, as that which is entrusted to the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal.

For eighty, if not for one hundred, years we have here been endeavouring to mould the traditions and usages of centuries by a higher and better code of ethics and law. And no measure conceived by an English statesman has had such a lasting influence as what is known as the Permanent Settlement of Lord Cornwallis. In 1793 that nobleman fixed for ever the demands of Government on the soil. At the same time he permanently recognised the status of some ancient Hindu Rajas; and others, Hindus and Mahomedans, he converted from collectors of the Land-tax, with some privileges, into Zemindars or landholders, with definite functions and valuable superior rights. But he never gave away to any class an absolute property in the soil, as the term is understood in England, or as it has been viciously contended for in India; nor did he extinguish the separate properties

of ryots and agriculturists. No measure, we repeat, has had results so remarkable and unexpected as this celebrated Settlement. In a short time the huge Zemindaries changed hands, or were divided and split up. An extraordinary labyrinth of sub-tenures has been created, each adding a new burden to the back of the ryot, and each removing the superior holder one step further from any sympathy with the masses. Against this we must set the fact that a thriving middle-class has thus sprung up, connected with the land, and yet not prevented from following other professions. In three generations of unbroken peace population has multiplied; lands have been reclaimed from the swamp and the forest; recent legislation has interfered on behalf of the ryots, and has done that which Lord Cornwallis fully intended; and the great Settlement, while identifying more classes than one with the stability of the British power, has taught statesmen to beware how they cut off their successors from all participation in the increments of extended agriculture and unchecked prosperity. The name of Lord Cornwallis was, however, till lately used as a bugbear to frighten English administrators, and to mislead public opinion; and the neglect which Bengal experienced in the mere form of government contributed to make matters worse. For many years Bengal had no separate administration. It was governed, at odd moments, by the Governor-General as Governor of Bengal, and without a Council. When the English statesman was absent on the frontier, influencing Kabul politics, watching the Sikhs, or fighting them, Bengal got on as well as it could under the senior member of Council, who was termed Deputy-Governor, and who might be a gallant and grey-haired general officer, versed in war, but, as Dominie Sampson said of Colonel Mannerling, possessed of "erudition" only through "imperfect opportunities." Lord Dalhousie put an end to an intolerable grievance, and procured for Bengal in 1842 a separate Lieutenant-Governor, such as the North-West Provinces had enjoyed ever since 1842. Four able and distinguished men filled the office in succession up to 1871. They each had their trials, but under each Bengal made certain strides in advance. On taking charge of his office, Mr. Campbell saw at once that it was desirable to alter and improve a condition of things which had silently grown up, and which arose neither from any one act of mistaken policy nor from any individual error or failing. Under the Perpetual Settlement natives looked to the courts of justice for everything, and the art of governing Asiatics vigorously was on the decline. We should state, in palliation, that in other Presidencies there exist more native functionaries who are links between the high British officials and the native community; that by their means the Executive can reach downward to the masses; that the magistrate in the North-West, the Deputy-Commissioner in Oudh, have more instruments at command and have been more encouraged to restrain or to repel native originality, and to direct the current of indigenous forces. But it had become too much a fashion to say that Bengal could only be governed by the courts of law. Every measure was liable to be tested by a litigation in the local tribunals. The Perpetual Settlement became a cloak for every dereliction of duty, and an impediment to every desirable reform. Mr. Campbell, with pardonable sarcasm, says, that "at one time to ask a ryot his name anywhere but in a court of justice would have been considered by some people contrary to the principles of the Permanent Settlement." Now it cannot be a sound and healthy state of things that a quick-sighted community should have no test of public or national duty but the four corners of legal enactments. One nation may submit to be outwardly governed by insolent deputations to Ministers and by defiant meetings in public places, while what is wanting to executive vigour is supplied by the good sense and the self-government of the majority. Another nation may bow to a benevolent despot, who rules the masses as if he had descended from a more enlightened planet, and who, like Augustus, *omnium mania in se trahit*. But an administration halfway between these extremes, and not tending to either, is in a rather sorry plight. It cannot be right that all moral feeling of public duty on the part of the people should slumber, and that at the same time the arm of the Executive should be impotent or weak.

Mr. Campbell, in order to wake up the administrative agency, has restored to the district officer some of the functions of which he had gradually been deprived. The magistrate will henceforth be not merely the nominal head of the Executive, but he will have that control over the local public works which he ought to have had long ago, as well as the supervision of the gaol and the police, which he ought never to have lost. There will still be agencies for these branches of the public service; skilled inspectors to track criminals; medical officers to combine penal discipline with sanitation; and district engineers to build offices that will resist tornadoes, and bridges that will not tumble down. But these will be the subordinates and not the jealous antagonists of the magistrate; and he, in his turn, will be supreme over everything but the courts of justice, and responsible to the Government as the guardian of order and the interpreter of native opinion. While thus galvanising the various agencies into life, Mr. Campbell had matured two elaborate schemes for municipal or communal self-government. One of them is known as the Rond Cess Act, and it has received the assent of the Viceroy. The other was intended to establish various forms of municipality, each with a choice of taxation, in towns and villages. But we learn by telegram that Lord Northbrook has been induced to withhold his sanction from this enactment; probably from a feeling that the measure, however excellent, can afford to wait. It would require more space than we can spare to give an adequate idea of other reforms in progress or

actually carried out. The keystone of the policy, in Mr. Campbell's own words, is greater vigour and activity "in compelling the honest performance by each class of the obligations which undoubtedly attach to it by law, but which are too often evaded in practice." But decided steps have been taken with such grave matters as the improvement of the estates of minors, the cure of the epidemic known as the Burdwan fever, the adjustment of civil and commercial jurisdictions and their boundaries, the equalization of salaries, the establishment of model farms, land and water communication, the conservancy of forests, the collection of accurate statistics, and the education of the masses.

Of course all this could not be even attempted without arousing hostility. Nor would it be safe to predict a triumph for every one of these reforms, or a cessation of all disparaging comments about overworking the district officers and attempting too much. But we have rarely seen a Report or Blue Book which is so superior to the average of such operose chronicles. It is throughout attractive, animated, and even pungent; not overweighted with statistics, and nowhere justifying Lord Brougham's sarcasm about the "eloquence which evaporates in scores of paragraphs." There is, in places, a controversial tone and colouring, but the writer has for a year and a half been persistently criticized and misrepresented, and this is just such an excellent vindication on paper of a distinct line of policy as a badgered English Minister might rejoice to make in a speech before a crowded House. Some paragraphs exhibit an earnestness which would do honour to Mr. Gladstone, and others an epigrammatic terseness of which Mr. Disraeli himself would not be ashamed. A good deal of the opposition which Mr. Campbell has encountered is due, we are assured, not to the substance and scope of his measures, but to the mode in which he presents them for the acceptance of his subordinates, whom he must carry with him, and of the public, whom he ought to try to please. And he should recollect that even Indian officials are not exempt from the frailties of human nature, and have angles in their bodies and come on their toes. But we have no reason whatever to doubt that the Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal is justifying his selection, is worthily striving for the best interests of a splendid province and an intelligent people, and will leave behind him legacies of political thought and creative energy which future administrators will be very glad to adopt.

THE WORKING-MAN.

PEOPLE are beginning to look back upon the worship of the working-man—that queer sort of political religion which prevailed for a year or two—with some degree of contemptuous amazement. The spell is broken, and the idol stands revealed in its coarse and common clay; indeed the danger now is lest the current of opinion should run into the opposite extreme. Nothing of course could be more absurd or preposterous than the notion that the working-man was the great mainstay of the commonwealth; the model citizen who alone was pure, high-minded, and disinterested, and who possessed a kind of native sagacity which enabled him to solve offhand the most intricate and difficult problems of society and government. Recent events have not quite borne out this view, and a reaction has set in. It may be admitted that of late the working-man has been rather tiresome and exasperating. He not only insists upon high wages, but demands leisure in order to spend his wages and enjoy his prosperity. Of course no other class of the community was ever known to do anything of this kind. It is notorious that shopkeepers, barristers, merchants, country gentlemen, all work as hard as they can, because they know it is for the good of the country, and that they never think for a moment of their own ease and pleasure. It is only coal-heavers who refuse to labour continuously for their country's good, and who are unscrupulous enough to take advantage of a rising market to serve their own selfish ends. For our own part, as we never supposed that the working-man was an angel, we are not particularly surprised at his want of angelic attributes. It is just as well to look facts in the face and to take the working-man as he is in real life, not an angel certainly, but then not exactly the reverse. What has always puzzled us is why there should be any mystery about the character of the working-man. We have most of us at some time or other seen one, and in all probability spoken to him and had some sort of business transactions with him. Up and down London—and we have a notion it is the same in the country—working-men are about as common as anything can be. But who ever met the ideal working-man of the Radical Philosopher? If a traveller assured us that in a distant land, never before explored, he had found men of an extraordinary type, we might perhaps be disposed to believe him; but if he declared that these strange men were constantly walking up and down Piccadilly, we should surely wonder why we never saw any of them. Anybody can see and judge for himself what sort of a being the working-man is; yet there are apparently people who, although they see him every day of their lives, are prepared to believe almost anything they are told about him. In reality he is by no means a bad fellow; good-natured, kindly, simple-minded, though without high notions of honour, and with anything but a high standard of work; loyal to his fellows and suspicious of other classes; ignorant and prejudiced; leading a rough life, rough in his ways, and fond of his pot and his pipe. In his ignorance of political economy he fancies that masters can afford to pay almost any wages that may be demanded from them, being sure to get back the money from the public. In his place no doubt we should be much as he is. No class has a

monopoly either of virtues or vices, and to be honest we must admit that circumstances have often a good deal to do with moral and immoral qualities. The three great defects of the working-man—his intemperance, his improvidence, and his reckless readiness to fling up work—are in a great measure due to his want of education. We may be willing to make every allowance for the working-man; but it would be idle to shut our eyes to his weak points, and to endow him with all kinds of imaginary qualities which he does not possess. It is possible to have the deepest sympathy with the working-man, and to be most sincerely anxious to promote his welfare, without pretending to believe that he is a very superior and perfect being. In the same way, without any hostility to Trade Unions, as combinations of working-men to promote their own interests, we may be permitted to doubt whether they are ever likely to succeed in establishing the artificial system of trade profits on which all their hopes are bent, or whether it would be good for them if they did. On the other hand, it is unnecessary to attribute the follies and failings of the working classes to moral turpitude.

The truth is, the working-man is wonderfully like other men. There is a vast deal of human nature about him. He laughs when tickled, and cries out when pinched, and is in most things subject to much the same impulses, affections, and passions as the rest of us. He thinks of himself first, and of other people afterwards, or not at all. He has a notion that the world should be ordered to suit his convenience, and that there must be something wrong about things he does not like, and which interfere with his projects. But we are not quite sure that other classes of society are altogether exempt from these failings. The working classes are sadly ignorant, and in their ignorance self-willed, and they are doing themselves and others a vast amount of mischief; but this is folly rather than wickedness. The great mistake which is made about the labouring population is in supposing that it is something quite apart from the rest of the community, and either exempt from ordinary laws and duties or subject to special ones which do not operate elsewhere. There is one point, however, in which the working classes differ very much from other classes, and it deserves to be especially noted, for it goes far to account for their restlessness and discontent. This point is the uncertain and fluctuating conditions of their employment. A clerk or a shopman, if he is steady and fit for his work, and if his master prospers, keeps his situation from year to year. He is liable to be thrown out of employment by a variety of accidents, but these are the exceptions and not the rule. In a general way he remains for at least a year or two in a place, and when he contemplates a change, he takes care not to lift his foot till he sees another spot where he can put it down. But the life of the working-man is usually one of uncertainty and change. Even in large establishments the number of permanent hands is comparatively few, and the great body of men are liable to be sent adrift at a week's notice. A "Journeyman Engineer," who has written a series of exceedingly interesting and instructive papers on the condition of the working classes, under the title of "Our New Masters," states that, as a rule, the permanent staff in manufacturing establishments is not more than ten per cent. of the number of workmen the place is capable of employing; and in very slack times this small nucleus will alone be kept on—the rest will be disbanded. He adds that the calculations of observant working-men are that "a flush" of trade and subsequent slack time occur every seven years. The gradual rise from the average to the "flush" condition occupies a year, and the flush lasts six months; then the decline down to slackness also lasts a year, and the slack six months. During the other four out of the seven years things will be in the average state, which is from ten to twenty per cent. below the full-handed condition; and "even in ordinary times there are considerable fluctuations, hands being habitually discharged or stopped, as the passing exigencies of work may require." This is, no doubt, in the main a true picture. If during the flush period the men put by their surplus earnings, they would be able to equalize their income, and provide against the hardships of the slack times, which come round, it would seem, only too regularly. But this is just what, as a rule, they don't do. They subscribe, perhaps, to the Union, and trust to that and to their luck, and get as much enjoyment out of the sunshine, while it lasts, as they can. The "Journeyman Engineer" gives the following ideal sketch of what men of his class would consider a fairly good condition:—

That every man who was willing and able to work should be able to obtain employment at such wages and with such a degree of constancy as would enable him, by judicious management, to secure for himself and those depending upon him a sufficiency of plain food and clothing and a dwelling with, say, the same sanitary conveniences and air-space per person as a model prison cell, and to make provision during a working-life of from forty to forty-five years for passing the remainder of his days without the necessity of hard work; not so much with a view to his mere personal ease, as to the contingency of his being no longer able to find a market for his labour, by reason of the physical deterioration that age and so many years of wear and tear must bring.

There is a touch of clumsy satire in the reference to the prison-cell, but otherwise the picture is prosaic and moderate enough. It is because the Union is almost their only help towards the attainment of this ideal that the men cling to it so, and submit to so much for the sake of its aid. It is their only plank; all they have to trust to when cast out upon the waves. Strikes and Unions are unknown except among working-men. Men in regular employment never dream of resorting to such expedients; and this is because regular employment holds them fast on the other side. Undoubtedly the working-men would do better if

they trusted more to themselves and less to the Unions, of which there will probably be a grand crash one of these days, most of them being, according to actuaries' calculations, hopelessly insolvent. If the men would only learn to save, they might become comparatively independent; and, as education spreads, habits of providence may be expected to come too. On the other hand, employers should take to heart the reason why the Unions command such influence, and consider whether by any means they cannot put themselves in the place of the Unions, and attach their men by similar ties.

Those who desire to understand the composition of that part of the community which is known as the working classes will find a graphic description of it in the pages of the "Journeymen Engineer." The working classes, he shows, are not a homogeneous, unanimous body. They are practically distinct classes, between which there are differences quite as patent and strongly marked as between other classes of society. There is an educated and really intelligent section, and an uneducated and ignorant section; a political section (broken up again into several sub-sections), and a non-political section; a Trade-Unionist, and a non-Trade-Unionist section; a sober, steady, saving section, and a drunken, unsteady, thriftless section; and, "with the labour market habitually overstocked, there is fast arising a sectional difference of mode of life and feeling between the regularly and irregularly employed classes." Between the artisan and the unskilled labourer a gulf is fixed. While the former, we are told, resents the spirit in which he imagines that those engaged in "gentle occupations" look down on him, he in his turn looks down upon and despises the labourer. The artisan view with regard to labourers is that they are an inferior class, and must be made to know and to keep their place. "In the eyes alike of Unionist and non-Unionist mechanics, any clever or ambitious labourer who shows a desire to get out of his place by attempting to pick up or creep into the trade to which he is attached as an unskilled assistant is guilty of deadly sin, and deserving of the abhorrence of all right-thinking members of the craft." Artisans' wives either patronize or ignore the wives of labourers. While the artisan is anxious to level down society so as to improve his own social rank, the labourer would like to carry the levelling process a stage further down. Educated and uneducated workmen also stand apart; "no one has so impatient a contempt for the uneducated working-men as have the educated working-men," and the former naturally resent it. There are three great schools of working-men. There is the working-man of the old school, who prides himself on being "rough and tough," despises fine manners and soft ways, and has rather a contempt for book learning. He is usually self-reliant, industrious, and independent; distrusts other classes, and thinks that working-men had better avoid having anything to do with anybody but themselves. There is another type, more intelligent, and, if not much better educated, at least appreciating education, and anxious for it for their children; more given to amusements, holiday-making, and dress than the man of the old school. Then there is what the "Journeymen Engineer" calls the coming or rising school, composed of fairly educated men, with broader views and sympathies than the other two schools, but perhaps somewhat priggish and conceited. Through all three classes—though it is less conspicuous among the last—runs a kind of Ishmaelite feeling, a feeling that the hand of every one is against them, and that in self-defence they must stand up against every other class. For the present the different schools and sections of the working classes appear to be so divided in feeling as to be incapable of united action for a common object. Whether they will gradually coalesce among themselves, while holding aloof from other classes, remains to be seen.

Of the home life of a large body of the working classes the "Journeymen Engineer" draws a black and painful picture, the tints of which are, we fear, only too true. Only those who go about among them can have any idea of the overcrowding which prevails in their dwellings, and of its melancholy and appalling consequences. This overcrowding is not confined to what are sometimes called "low" districts. It is to be found also in many respectable and cleanly looking streets; nor does it always stop short even at a room for each family. The "Engineer" says that he knows parts of London where not only houses, but even single rooms, are sub-let, so that when families fall out they tell each other to keep, not their own room, but their own corner. Horrible and dangerous as this state of things is, it is easier to point out the evil than to suggest a remedy. No effective impression can be made on it without the co-operation of the working classes themselves, and unfortunately this is not readily to be obtained. They grudge the price of decent lodgings, even when they can afford to pay it, and cram as many inmates as possible into stifling rooms. Mr. Lowe said very truly, some years ago, that if the poor were willing to pay a rent sufficient to provide them with decent and healthy dwellings, capital would flow into the business just as it does into the business of building public houses and gin-shops. In any case, the question is one of which it is impossible to exaggerate the gravity, and which deserves the attention, not only of philanthropists, but of statesmen.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL CONTEST IN SWITZERLAND.

THE backwater of the ecclesiastical tempest raging in Germany, to which we have frequently called attention of late, has already reached to Switzerland; for some weeks past a religious

quarrel, with Geneva and Soleure (Solothurn) for its centres, has been rapidly developing itself, which almost recalls, as well from its bitterness as from several names of the same localities being prominent in both cases, the civil war of the Sonderbund. The dispute about Mgr. Mermilliod, Bishop—or, we should say, Vicar-Apostolic—of Geneva, has attracted a good deal of notice in the English newspapers, though its intrinsic importance is small as compared with the controversy between rival parties of Catholics in the diocese of Basle. We will first, however, speak of the Geneva affair, which has just reached what may be considered the end of the first act of the drama, in the expulsion of Mgr. Mermilliod by the Cantonal authorities, acting under the full sanction of the Federal Council. As the origin of the quarrel is at first sight somewhat obscure, it may be convenient to premise that during its annexation to France under Napoleon I., Geneva, which had then a mainly Protestant population, formed part of the French diocese of Chambéry; but on its restoration to Switzerland it was transferred, at the request of the Council of the newly-formed Canton, and with the sanction of a Papal Brief, to the Swiss diocese of Lausanne and Freiburg. So matters remained till a few months ago, when the Pope, for reasons never explained, but popularly connected with the personal ambition of Mgr. Mermilliod, who is a zealous infallibilist and brilliant preacher, took on himself to constitute a separate Vicariate of Geneva, thus severing it from the episcopal jurisdiction of the Bishop of Lausanne, without consulting the civil authorities at all in the matter, or, it is said, taking any account of the wishes of the Catholic inhabitants. The Council of State, not unnaturally, declined to endorse this summary proceeding by recognizing Mgr. Mermilliod in his new capacity of Vicar-Apostolic; while, on the other hand, the Bishop of Lausanne was compelled, under orders from Rome, to decline acceding to the wishes of the Government by continuing to exercise episcopal functions in Geneva. What were the motives of the Curia in this high-handed policy, or in the studied courtesy, and indeed illegality, of the method of carrying it out—for the Concordat of 1819 was arbitrarily violated—it is difficult to understand, unless it be a sufficient motive to prove what, if we recollect rightly, was announced the other day by Cardinal Antonelli to the Prussian Government, that Concordats do not bind the Holy See, but only the Powers which become parties to them. The Council of State retaliated by a Bill which, after undergoing certain modifications at the hands of a special Committee chiefly formed of Catholics, has now become law, and which enacts that no episcopal or parochial jurisdiction shall be allowed in the Canton without the approval of the State, and that for the future all parish priests shall be elected by the Catholic inhabitants, and removable by the State for sufficient cause. A proposal to submit the existing incumbents to the process of election was rejected, as was also the proposal for an entire separation of Church and State. Meanwhile the new Bishop continued to act as such, though his salary—formerly paid to him as parish priest of Notre-Dame—had been withdrawn, and a Papal Brief of January 16, 1873, announcing his appointment, was read in the Catholic churches of Geneva. When this Brief was communicated by Mgr. Agnozi, the Papal Nuncio at Berne, to the Federal Council, they declined to acknowledge its validity, or the right of the Holy See to dismember Swiss dioceses without the consent of the civil power, in accordance with the arrangement of 1819. And the Cantonal Council was directed to communicate this decision to Mgr. Mermilliod, and in doing so to inform him that he must either resign his illegal dignity within a certain fixed period or leave the country. They named two o'clock on the following Saturday (February 15) as the time, and the Bishop then sent in a letter defending the procedure of the Holy See in appointing him, as a necessary and provisional measure which violated no political rights, and declining to lay down his office. On the Sunday he preached at Geneva, and on the Monday morning was arrested by the police, and conveyed beyond the French frontier to Ferney, where he has elected to remain for the present. The great majority of the Catholic population are understood to have been opposed to the ecclesiastical changes and to side with the Government in the matter. As far as appears on the surface, no doctrinal questions are involved, but Mgr. Mermilliod is well known, as we before observed, to be a red-hot Ultramontane, and it was he who preached at Rome during the Vatican Council on the Pope as an incarnation of the Deity. On the other hand, there is evidently, if we may judge from the invitation sent to Father Hyacinthe, a strong body of Old Catholics at Geneva.

In the diocese of Basle the quarrel had its origin directly in the conflict of the two parties in the Church. Mgr. Lachat, the Bishop, is an infallibilist, and has been during the last two years—for he did not venture before February 1871 on publishing the decrees of the Vatican Council—in constant trouble with the members of his flock, who took an early opportunity of protesting against the Council in a Diocesan Conference of the seven Cantons which are embraced in his diocese, and with the civil authorities who supported them in their resistance. We referred some weeks ago to the vigorous and popular discourses of Reinkens during the first week of December at various places, including Soleure, where the Bishop himself resides, and the adhesion of several Catholic parishes to the movement. During the present month Friedrich and Michelis have been addressing assemblies of three thousand persons on "the classical soil" of Constance, and in the very Council Chamber where the

great protest against Papal autocracy was solemnized four centuries ago by the deposition of John XXIII., and they appear to have been received with the most unbounded enthusiasm, the crowd thronging the entrances and outskirts of the hall to hear them. The Bishop, on the other hand, has been suspending and excommunicating anti-infallibilist priests right and left, and hence matters have at length come to a crisis. On November 19 of last year the Diocesan Conference of the seven Cantons again assembled at Soleure to condemn his arbitrary and illegal proceedings; and on January 29 they met a third time and announced, in a document addressed to the Catholic population, the deposition of the Bishop for having violated the law requiring the *place* of the Government before promulgating Papal decrees, issued irregular sentences of excommunication and deposition, and in other ways disregarded ecclesiastical and civil rights, which his predecessors had always been careful to observe. He was also charged with taking part in a political agitation against the Government. The Conference communicated their decision to the Federal Council, who were requested to take steps in concert with the Holy See for filling up the vacancy, and also to the Chapter of the diocese at Soleure, inviting them to name a temporary administrator of the diocese. The Chapter met on the 4th of February, and determined not to accede to this request, on the ground that the see was not vacant. Meanwhile the Bishop himself, in an elaborate protest, the conclusion of which alone occupies a column of close print in the *Allgemeine Zeitung*, denounces the charges made against him as "crying and abominable calumnies." Its leading points are a denial of any acts of civil insubordination, and a haughty repudiation of all right on the part of the civil authorities to interfere in any way with his episcopal jurisdiction; as, for instance, in the promulgation of Papal decrees, or the appointment and removal of parish priests—a plea the validity of which of course depends entirely in the case of an Established Church on the character of the existing arrangements between Church and State, which the Bishop is accused of systematically ignoring. He appeals at great length, against the insulting sentence of the incompetent Diocesan Conference, to his conscience, to the Catholic people, to the tribunal of the successor of Peter, who is his supreme judge, and to the just judgment of the Almighty; and winds up by declaring his fixed resolution to continue to rule his flock—who do not seem quite to appreciate the privilege—and his readiness to die for them, which is not likely to be put to the test. This protest was addressed in the first instance to the Governments of the five Cantons of Soleure, Berne, Aargau, Thurgau, and Basle, but an identical or similar document has since been forwarded to the Federal Council. Both the episcopal protest and the reply of the Chapter, which is very temperate and conciliatory in its language, declining to name an *ad interim* vicar, were to be laid before the Diocesan Conference on February 14, but the results do not appear to have yet transpired. Meanwhile the Bishop has been ejected from his palace at Soleure, but continues to reside there, at the Diocesan Seminary.

It will be at once perceived that there is much in common between the Swiss and German complications in matters ecclesiastical; with this difference however, that the anti-infallibilist Catholica have presented a more united front in Switzerland, and the action of the Government has been more rapid and consistent. In all the stages of the Basle controversy, till the last, the delegates of every Canton in the diocese worked together; but the Cantons of Zug and Lucerne held aloof from the final act of deposition. At Geneva also the Catholic representatives approved the action of the Government in contesting the pretensions of the new Bishop. On the other hand, no names as yet stand out prominently, like those of Friedrich or Michelin or Schulte in Germany, among the opponents of infallibilism, and the fact of the German leaders having twice within a few months been invited to give their personal assistance to the movement looks as if there were a scarcity of native energy or talent available for the purpose. The next move in the game will be watched with much curiosity by both parties, and it will be interesting to observe whether the accustomed tact of the Roman Curia, which seems of late to have been strangely at fault, will be equal to the emergency. Meanwhile the regretful apology of a Swiss representative at the Cologne Congress of last September, for so little having as yet been achieved by his countrymen for the Old Catholic cause, will certainly not need to be repeated. If the Germans have shown more readiness, as becomes their national reputation, to defend it by learned argument, the Swiss have at least earned the praise of being prompt in arriving at their practical conclusions, and resolute in applying them. And the Pope himself appears at length to have gained some inkling of the gravity of the religious crisis. In a highly characteristic letter to Mgr. Mermillod, who is compared to the bishops and martyrs of the first ages of the Church, he exhorts him, with significant reference to the dogmatic controversy which lies at the root of the quarrel, to "teach the people committed to your charge to observe all that you have been commanded to enforce"; but His Holiness at the same time admits the perilous consequences of such a course. For he observes, not without reason, that Switzerland is "threatened with a terrible schism." And he might well have added, not Switzerland alone.

OUR MASKS.

WE should do badly, as things are ordered, if we went about the world with our natural faces. Even stopping short of the extravagance of betraying our most important secrets, as in a Palace of Truth, and frankly telling men and women that we think them fools or bores, it is difficult in society to do without something of a mask in regard to minor matters. The old quarrel between nature and art, and where the limits of each should extend, has not yet got itself arranged; and it is doubtful whether it will during the present dispensation. It may be arranged in some future state of human development, when the Spiritualists have it all their own way and tell us exactly what we ought to do and what we ought to believe; but, pending this forecast of the millennium, we are obliged to have recourse to art for the better concealment of our natural selves, and especially, too, for the maintenance of that queer bundle of compromises and conventions which we call society.

The oddest consequence of the artificial state in which we find ourselves obliged to live is that nature looks like affectation, and that the highest art is the most like nature of anything we know. It is in drawing-rooms as on the stage. A thoroughly inartificial actor would be a mere dummy, just as in the Greek theatre a man in his natural face would have seemed mean and insignificant to the spectators accustomed to fixed types of heroic size and set intention. But he whose acting brings the house down because of its "truth to nature" is he whose art has been the most profoundly studied, and with whom the concealment of art has therefore been the most perfectly attained. So in society. A man of thoroughly natural manners would pass as either morose or pert according to his mood—either stupid because disinclined to exert himself, or obtuse because in the humour to talk. He would mean no offence, but he would make himself disagreeable all the same. Such a man is the pest of his club, and the nuisance of every drawing-room he enters. It matters little whether he is constitutionally boorish or good-natured; he is natural; and his naturalness comes like an ugly patch of frieze on the cloth of gold with which the goddess of conventionality is draped. Natural women, too, may be found at times—women who demonstrate on small occasions, sincerely no doubt, but excessively; women who skip like young lambs when they are pleased, and pout like naughty children when they are displeased; who disdain all those little arts of dress which conceal defects and heighten beauties, and who are always at war with the fashions of the day; who despise those conventional graces of manner which have come to be part of the religion of society, contradicting point-blank, softening no refusal with the expression of a regret they do not feel, yawning in the face of the bore, admiring with the *naïveté* of a savage whatever is new to them or pleasing. Such women are not agreeable companions, however devoid of affectation they may be, however staunch adherents to truth and things as they are, according to their boast. The woman who has not a particle of untrained spontaneity left in her, and who has herself in hand on all occasions, who gives herself to her company, and who is always collected, graceful, and at ease, playing her part without a trip, but always playing her part and never letting herself drop into uncontrolled naturalness—this is the woman whom men agree to call, not only charming, but thoroughly natural as well. On the other hand, the untrained woman who speaks just as she thinks, and who cares more to express her own sensations than to study those of her companions, is sneered at as silly or underbred, as the current sets, or perhaps as affected; her transparency, to which the world is not accustomed, and to which it does not wish to get accustomed, puzzling the critics of their kind. Social naturalness, like perfect theatrical representation, is everywhere the result of the best art; that is, of the most careful training. It simulates self-forgetfulness by the very perfection of its self-control, while untrained nature is self-assertion at all corners, and is founded on the imperious consciousness of personality.

All of us carry our masks into society. We offer an eidolon to our fellow-creatures, showing our features but not expressing our mind; and the one whose eidolon, while betraying least of the being within, reflects most of the beings without, is the most popular and considered the most natural. We may take it as a certainty that we never really know anyone. We may know the broad outlines of character; and we generally believe far more than we have warranty for; but we rarely, if ever, penetrate the inner-circle wherein the man's real self hides. If our friend is a person of small curiosity and large self-respect, we may trust him not to commit a base action; if he has a calm temperament, with physical strength and without imagination, he will not do a cowardly one; if he has the habit of truth, he will not tell a lie on any paltry occasion; if he is tenacious and secret, he will not betray his cause or his friend. But we know very little more than this. Even with one's most familiar friend there is always one secret door in the casket which is never opened; and those which are thrown wide are not those which lead to the most cherished treasures. With the frankest or the shallowest there are depths never sounded; what shall we say, then, of those who have real profundity of character? Who is not conscious of an ego that no man has seen? In praise or blame we feel that we are not thoroughly known. There is something infinitely pathetic in this dumb consciousness of an inner self, an unrevealed truth, which bears us up through injustice and makes us shrink from excessive praise. Our very

lovers love us for the least worthy part of us, or for fancied virtues which we do not possess; and if our worst enemies knew us as we are, they would come round to the other side and shake hands over the grave of their mistaken estimate. The mask hides the reality in either case, for good or for ill; and we know that if it could be removed, we should be judged differently. For the matter of that it never can be removed. The most transparent are judged according to the temper of the spectator; and the mind sees what it brings in our judgment of our fellows as well as in other things.

But, apart from that inner nature, that hidden part which so few people ever guess to exist in each other, the masks we wear in society cover histories, sufferings, feelings, that would set the world afire if betrayed. No one who gets below the smooth crust of conventional life can be ignorant of the fierce lava flood that sometimes flows and rages underneath. In those quiet drawing-rooms where everything looks the embodiment of harmony, of tranquil understanding, and where the absence of mystery is the first thing felt, there are dramas at the very time enacting of which only the exceptionally observant catch the right cue. Ruin faces some whose ship of good fortune seems sailing steadily on a halcyon sea; a hideous secret stands like a spectre in the doorway of another. The domestic happiness which these covenant between themselves to show in the full sunshine to the world is no better than a Dead Sea apple displayed for pride, for policy, and of which those who eat alone know the extreme bitterness. The prosperity which makes men bow down is a sham, and tottering to its fall. Here the confessing religionist hides the scepticism which he dares not show by the fervour of his amens; there the respectable moralist denounces in his mask the iniquities which he practises daily when he lays it aside; to the right the masks of two loving friends greet each other with smiles and large expressions of affection, then part, to push the friendly falsehood aside, and to whisper confidentially to the crowd what scoundrelism they have mutually embraced; to the left another couple of unreasoning foes want only to see each other in unmasks simplicity to become fast allies for life. The world and all its disguises play sad mischief with human affections as well as with truth.

Everything serves for a mask. A man's public character makes one which is as impenetrable in its disguise as any. The world takes one or two salient points, and subordinates every other characteristic to these. It ignores all those subtle intricacies which modify thought and action at every turn, producing apparent inconsistency, but only apparent; and it boldly blocks out a mask of one or two dominant lines as the representative of a nature protean because complex. Any quality that makes itself seen from behind this mask which popular opinion has created out of a man's public character is voted as inconsistent, or, it may be, insincere; and the richer the nature the less it is understood. So it is with us all in our degree; a thought which might lead us to gentler judgments on each other than it is the fashion to cultivate, knowing as we do that we each wear a mask which hides our real self from the world; and that if this real self is less beautiful than our admirers say, it is infinitely less hideous than our enemies would make it to appear.

WARNINGS TO EMIGRANTS.

A GREAT deal of money has been made in Mexico, Brazil, and the old Spanish colonies of South America, and it is certain that there is a great deal more to be made there. It was from the silver mines of Peru and Mexico that those treasure galleons of Ferrol and Cadiz were freighted which enriched many a bold English adventurer as well as the grandees and merchants of old Spain. The diamond mines of Minas Geraes were rich in their yield when those of Golconda had begun to be worn out, and at this moment English companies are working at a profit by the help of modern machinery the gold deposits which had been abandoned by native Brazilians after great returns had been drawn from the surface veins. It is easy to see how those countries should be still enveloped in the vague haze of their former golden reputation—a reputation founded much on fact and very much more on fable; it is intelligible that the old legends and romances of the past should have their influence even now on the most practical, prosaic, and uneducated classes of the English people. Even persons who look more closely into the matter may be attracted towards Southern America by temptations less speculative than its mineral wealth. The new Railway Companies of Brazil, which have constructed their lines chiefly with English capital, have been paying increasing dividends, thanks to the rapidly increasing growth of coffee and cotton. The merchants of Rio de Janeiro, Pernambuco, and Bahia have obtained deservedly the reputation of enormous wealth. There is a rich commercial community too at Buenos Ayres, and then to the south of the Portuguese States, on the great plains by the Plata and other rivers, the pastoral element comes into play. There are sheep masters and cattle masters, who, like the patriarchs, have their flocks and herds ranging over magnificent grazing ground that is practically limitless. They live in rude luxury in *estancias* that resemble little towns, and if their flocks suffer occasionally from drought and disease, the lean years are far more than compensated by the fat ones. Undoubtedly there is money to be made in those countries still, if the right people set about it in the right way.

But we suspect that the right people are seldom found among

foreigners, and Englishmen especially are exceedingly unlikely to go to work in the right way. Capitalists combining in alliance with native money may have a certain success, as is proved in the case of the thriving Anglo-Brazilian Companies. But even these Companies, notwithstanding the support and advice of native partners, have had their troubles in the beginning of their enterprises almost without exception. They have been constrained to vindicate their claims and the terms of their concessions by aid of the cumbersome machinery of native law courts, and they have often found themselves positively hampered by the acceptance of Government guarantees. It follows, as a matter of course, that the chances of an individual are worse than dubious, even though he may have money, energy, ability, and connexion. What, then, must be the probable fate of the ignorant and helpless emigrant who signs away his freedom of action, and places himself at the mercy of those local authorities or native employers who consider him only in so far as he is likely to serve their purposes? We have little reason to be surprised at the complaints which have recently made their way into the papers, which have been ventilated in Parliament, which have been endorsed by several of our diplomatic agents, and whose substantial truth has been admitted by the chief of the Foreign Office. For years past we have heard pitiful tales of disappointment and suffering, which have been severely commented on at the time, only in the course of things to be speedily forgotten. It is somewhat of a coincidence, however, that in three successive days charges should have been brought successively against the treatment of English emigrants in three separate South American States. In the *Times* of February 14 there appeared a document promulgated officially by the Emigration Commissioners, by desire of the Secretary of State for the Colonies. It states by way of preamble that, in spite of official warning given in last October, emigration has been still going on to Paraguay. It proceeds to state that the emigrants who went out in October found that the promises made to them had been broken, and that no arrangements whatever had been made for their reception. They were detained, half starved, and left shelterless. It is asserted further that the climate of the place of their destination is utterly unsuited to English constitutions. The summer heats are so intense that field labour becomes impossible; the only productions that can be grown are precisely those to which English labourers are altogether unaccustomed, while the country is in a chronic state of disturbance, and there is security neither for life nor property. The *Times* of the following day devotes an article to emigration to La Plata, which gives a picture very similar to the highly repulsive one which the Emigration Commissioners had drawn of Paraguay. It appears that Mr. Macdonell, our *chargé d'affaires* at Buenos Ayres, presumably a dispassionate witness, has written so strongly and frankly on the matter that, should his despatch be made public, he "is prepared to encounter a storm of obloquy in Buenos Ayres, and throughout the Argentine Republic." He considers that neither sheep-farming, cattle-farming, agriculture, mining, nor commerce presents openings to tempt emigrants. The protective financial policy of America has depressed the wool trade; the Ganchos are superior to any Englishmen as what the Australians call stockmen, and thus have the call of the cattle-market; the soil is rich, but the climate is treacherous; in rearing cereals you can only count on one good season out of five; while in mining industry and commerce local circumstances are likely to give native competitors the advantage of you. Finally, in the Argentine Republic, as in Paraguay, revolutions are the rule, and a peaceful and orderly state of things is the exception; while, so far as the sanctity of life is concerned, the murder rate there rises to one in 900, as against one in 170,000 in England. Lastly, on Monday the 17th Lord Carnarvon brought the case of some Brazilian emigrants before the House of Lords, and Lord Granville thanked him for drawing attention to the subject. A knot of labouring families from the midland counties had been lured out to Brazil by dazzling official promises and assurances. They had been promised land free or extremely cheap; they had been promised houses all in readiness for them; they had been promised free and speedy transport thither and abundance of good food on the journey. Lord Carnarvon quoted an advertisement purporting to come from the Brazilian Consul-General in Liverpool, which offered a pecuniary advance to any intending emigrant, and an allowance at the rate of two shillings a day while waiting for his first year's crops to come to maturity. It is alleged that the emigrants who responded to these tempting offers received neither money nor houses, and very little food. They had to sleep on the damp ground, were brought to the brink of starvation, if they were not forced over it, and it may be assumed that death and disease made melancholy ravages among them.

We presume that, coming to us on authority apparently so unimpeachable, we may accept these sad stories as strictly true in the main. If so, it is the duty of every one who chances to have the ear of such labouring men as are likely to be deluded to represent the facts to them as they really are. The invitations are made sufficiently seductive, and if they have not met with more general acceptance, it can be owing only to that conservative clinging to familiar scenes which is so strong in the rural districts, or to a no less natural preference for settling among people of one's own speech and blood. What can be more seductive to a labourer toiling in all weathers from morning to night, struggling along on low wages and the occasional help of a parish allowance, than the prospect of settling on a little property of

his own in a superb climate, and on a soil where everything grows spontaneously or for the scratching? He is to fold his hands while his crops are growing, to fare sumptuously on two shillings a day, and for the first time in his life give himself over to the serene enjoyment of idleness. What can be more disengaging than the reality? In the first place, on disembarking in the land of promise, he finds that his ships have been burned behind him and his retreat cut off. There he is for good or for evil, as much a serf of the soil or a slave of the country, to all intents and purposes, as any Guiana cooly or Queensland Polynesian. He is in debt for his free passage-money, as for any subsequent pecuniary advance, supposing he has obtained one. Is he in a position to appeal to the courts of the strange country against the contractor to whom he is bound, or is his appeal likely to help him much? He knows no word of the language; he cannot even ask for bread or money in the speech of the people among whom he is cast. If he is to live at all, he has to bestir himself and try to work in a climate where we are told that work in summer is physically impossible for his constitution. He may have to sleep shelterless till he builds his own hut, in a country where fever is rife, and where the very atmosphere often seems tainted. In that La Plata and Paraguay country the most trifling scratch is apt to turn to a festering wound, and if once the blood fairly heats, sarsaparilla will do little for you. If you attempt to cultivate the fertile soil which breeds fevers so freely, you will find your crops fail four seasons out of five—that is to say, if you are wise enough to confine your attention to the only kind of agriculture which you have been used to. The lawless semi-savages around you dislike you as an intruder and detest you as a heretic. Your property may be safe, for the excellent reason which encourages the penniless traveller to sing in presence of banditti; but in a country where the murder rate is one in nine hundred, we may be sure that a due proportion of crimes will be committed upon people who have no friends and plenty of ill-wishers. We do not think that any one who has read the statements to which we have referred will say we have exaggerated the prospects of the humble emigrant to South America. We can only repeat the expression of our hope that every possible publicity will be given to disclosures which possibly may save some ignorant victims from chasing an *ignis fatuus* across the Atlantic to their own destruction. It may be a long voyage round the world to the antipodes, but those who make it will at least find an English home and English laws awaiting them at their destination; and New Zealand is just now suffering from a labour famine. Emigration to Canada, as we know, means in nine cases out of ten emigration to the United States; but if our people believe they can better themselves there, we must not grudge to the great and growing Republic citizens whom we may be sorry to part with. It is plainly our first duty to give the best advice in our power to those who are determined to leave us if they can find the means; and we trust that our labourers in future may find better advisers than the agents who have been recruiting for the South American States.

PORtUGUESE ENGLISH.

IT is no doubt improving to us all, as individuals, now and then "to see ourselves as others see us"; and candid friends are seldom wanting to afford the occasional opportunity. But when the mirror is to be held up to us in our national capacity, it is perhaps too sanguine to assume that the process will be equally beneficial. When one nation turns its attention to the habits, or customs, or institutions, or language of another, distance may or may not lend enchantment to the view, according to the pre-existing mood and sympathies of the observer; but it is pretty sure in most cases to produce distortion and misconception. We have all been familiar from boyhood with the sublime caricature which in the ordinary French imagination fills the place of the Lord Mayor of London; he moves about with a more than Oriental splendour in his personal adornments, he is weighted to the ground with care of State, he is the more than Mæcenas of his sovereign. We know also that these, among numberless other English facts, are familiar to the French mind—that the Prince of Wales is Hereditary Grand Master of the Chamber of Peers; that an impenetrable mist covers these islands from January 1 to December 31 in each year; and that, many long years ago, we were favoured with a great national bard, our poet of poets, whose name was the "divine Williams." We smile at these inaccuracies, and make up our minds that a few more years of International Exhibitions and extended Continental travel will supply the requisite correction. There is, however, reason to believe that, painfully wide of the mark as France may yet be with reference to our general characteristics, she is nevertheless accuracy itself when compared with some other nations of Europe. We are the more disposed to entertain this fear from having recently studied a very careful and painstaking little volume, designed to familiarize the Portuguese nation in general, and its youth in particular, with the most idiomatic twists and turns in our national speech. Now we are all aware that the language of a nation is very closely intertwined indeed with its institutions and its corporate life. This must be so from the very nature of the case; and the bare idea of a traveller attempting to investigate on the spot the social or political machinery of a country without a fairly scholarlike command of its language is justly held to be an absurdity. We are thus forced to believe that to

see ourselves as the Portuguese see us—their knowledge of ourselves being inferred from their knowledge of our language—might be an extremely odd diversion, but would scarcely bring solid instruction or salutary correction with it.

We must begin our extracts by observing that the author of the work before us holds a mean opinion of his predecessors in the same line. They have, he thinks, been careless in the extreme; it was therefore certain that their works would be imperfect in style; to say nothing of the fact that the printers did not do their duty. Perhaps we had better just say that the words "to say nothing of" have inadvertently got mixed up in the Portuguese writer's mind with the phrase "in spite of." Now let us hear him tell his own tale:—

It was resulting from that corelessness to rest these works full of imperfections of style: *in spite* of the infinite typographical faults which sometimes invert the sense of the periods.

In the author's own work these faults and imperfections have been happily avoided; and he confidently anticipates public approbation in the following extract. We shall do well to announce beforehand that genders, which in English nouns are almost non-existent, are by the large-hearted Portuguese author used with a pleasing liberality of conception; and that "who" is employed for "that" with the same venial inaccuracy with which an English writer might, when using the French language, write "qui," by a slip of the pen, in place of "que":—

We expect then, who the little book (for the care what we wrote him, and for her typographical correction), may be worth the acceptance of the studious persons, and especially of the youth, at which we dedicate him particularly.

Let us now see how we strike the Portuguese observer in our eminently national character as lovers of field sports. Here, if anywhere, we are at home; and here, if anywhere, we should be a little annoyed to find ourselves misconstrued. Well, language may not be everything; but we have a serious misgiving as to whether the framer of the following sentences would be the right man in the right place when he came to interpret our ways and doings to his fellow-countrymen. Let us hear him speak as he thinks that we speak:—

Load ours guns.

Look a hare who run! Let do him to pursue for the hounds! It go one'self in the ploughed land!

On a careful collation of this last phrase with the Portuguese original, which is printed *vis-à-vis*, a glimmering of the intended signification becomes apparent. The translator was racking his brains for the idiomatic expression "to go it"; and, having meant to say "how he is going it over the ploughed land," he produced the quoted phrase as the result. We may append a few more remarks made by the sportsmen:—

I have put down killed.

This, in the purest English is, it seems, the same as if a man should say, "I have knocked him over." The next gentleman is not so fortunate:—

Me, I have failed it; my gun have miss fixe.

Later in their conversation his thoughts glance with a genuine sportsmanlike transition from the field to the kitchen:—

If we kill nothing, we will have not any venison. I do flatter me to bring at my cook at least a wild boar head.

Archbishop Trench has not written in vain, it will be generally admitted that the proverbs of a nation are sure to convey a good deal of its vital movement in things which concern the heart and the intellect. Nor has this truth escaped the framer of the very compendious handbook which we are now admiring. Page after page of proverbs he has given us—proverbs not of the exclusive and peculiar, but of the cosmopolitan and universal class, like "Quot homines, tot sententiae" in the ancient world, and "A rolling stone gathers no moss" in the modern. We subjoin a few specimen quotations.—

So many heads so much opinions.

The necessity don't know the low.

Every one for him, and God for all.

The stone as roll not heap up not foam.

Help thy, that God will aid thee.

Spoken of the wolf, one see the tail.

In the country of blinds, the one-eyed men are kings.

It is, as we all know, our pleasing duty to inquire, ever and anon, after the health of a friend's wife when she has recently been placed in an interesting situation. This is all very proper, and all very natural; we expect the sort of answer that almost invariably comes; our friend accepts the attention, and both mother and child are fortunately doing well. But this is not to see ourselves as the Portuguese are intended to see us. By them we are supposed to put the question and answer in the following shape:—

Your wife is it brought to bed?

Yes, sir, and too fortunately.

Now, considering the high price of coals, and the very decided increase in our population, we cannot avoid the prophetic warning that some Bentleian emendator will by and by make his appearance, and that he will effect a considerable alteration in the answer to this friendly question. It may be quite true that "too fortunately" (as it stands) is intended to express a complete and happy satisfaction at the manner in which the crisis has been passed; but our Bentley of the future will know better; he will divine that the happy father is in reality lamenting his ill-destiny in the advent of twins; he will say that "too" must

have been written "two" in the original MS.; and that, in accordance with a frequently recurring *lacuna*, "unfortunately" should be restored for "fortunately"; so that the entire rejoinder will stand, "Yes, she is; and, worse luck, there are twins this time."

The following is the usual language of Englishmen when they are playing at cards:—

That bad game, there is not a trump.
What is to play?
It is madam.
Play, if you please.
The heart's aces.
I cut.
Trump.
I have no it, I have it.
I am very unhappy; always I lose.
This time, I have a great deal pack.

Our doctors, as we very well know, do not invariably follow their own prescriptions. On this head the Portuguese compiler has a good story to tell, and he tells it in his own idiomatic way:—

A physician eighty years of age had enjoyed of a health unalterable. Their friends did him of it compliments every day. "Mister doctor," they said to him, "you are admirable man. What you make then to bear you as well?" "I shall tell you it, gentlemen," he was answered them: "And I exhort you in same time at to follow my example. I live of the product of my ordering, without take any remedy who I command to my sicks."

Let us select two more instructive narratives, each of which will in its own way illustrate the directness of conception with which the Portuguese mind has mastered our English mode of expression. We only hope that ere long the Portuguese author may think it advisable to familiarize his countrymen with our national debates in the House of Commons, and that he may favour us with the result:—

A judge having ordered at any gendarmes to arrest a criminal, this, conducted at her presence, was shamed enough for to tell him that he was seemed to Pilatus.

The judge was answered him, "Condemning so great rogue as thee, I shall not have at less to wash my hands."

It will be scarcely necessary, perhaps, to observe that, "ordered at" means "ordered," that "any" means "some," and that "was seemed to" means "was like." There is almost a Chaucerian complexion about this last construction. We will wind up with one more anecdote:—

A patrol had met during the night a individual what had carried a wine bottle. This having asked what he had under her cloak, he answered jesting, "A poniard." "We will look it," replied the others. Our man present immediately her bottle. These had taken possession of it, and they had given back it empty, telling "Here, as thou art one of our friends, we deliver the scabbard."

THE THEATRES.

IT was no objection to a piece lately performed at the Globe Theatre that the title was borrowed from a poem of Tennyson which was quoted in the course of it. If the words "Tears! idle tears!" appearing in the playbill attracted a single visitor to the house, so much the better, although they are curiously inappropriate to a piece of avowed French extraction. A "romantic legend" has been produced within the last few days, called *Oriana*, and as Tennyson's ballad of that name would be wholly inapplicable to the character and situation of the heroine, one naturally expected that it would be quoted before the curtain fell. The name *Oriana* is pretty and uncommon. There are, we believe, some living persons who bear it, and possibly its appearance in theatrical advertisements may procure for it an introduction to baptismal registers. Fashion prevails at the font as well as everywhere else when women are implicated, and as regards names for girls a little novelty would be desirable, as will be admitted by every one who has happened to encounter "Ada" in the kitchen or "Florence" wielding a brush upon the stairs. We therefore hope that the example of Mr. Albery will be followed by other parents, especially as the remark that a rose called by some other name would smell as sweet is undeniably true in the case where the rose takes the name of "Oriana." It is perhaps surprising that, although this name has now been adopted on the stage, the character to which it properly belongs has never tempted any actress in recent years. The play of the *Knight of Malta* would perhaps prove incapable of adaptation to the modern stage, but there is much in the character and situation of the heroine that might tempt an enterprising manager. A "conventicle" of the Knights of St. John, in the Palace of the Grand Master at Malta, would be just the sort of scene that would bear any quantity of embellishment. *Oriana*, the sister of the Grand Master, is seated in a gallery. It is proposed to confer knighthood upon a noble Italian, *Miranda*, before sending him on an expedition against the Turks. But *Miranda* asks time for consideration before taking upon himself that honour, for which not only modesty, but his love for *Oriana*, makes him doubt his fitness. His parting words show the condition of his heart:—

Gracious mistress—
Oh, that auspicious smile doth arm your soldier!
Who fights for those eyes and this sacred cross
Can neither meet sad accident nor loss.

And her answer proves that she is not insensible of his love:—

The mighty master of that livery
Conduct thee safely to these eyes again.

No sooner is *Miranda* gone than another aspirant to the Order, a Spaniard of equally good birth, *Gomera*, declares that the same impediment stands in his way:—

I am in love. Laugh not! Though Time hath set
Some wrinkles in this face, and these curl'd locks
Will shortly die into another hue,
Yet, yet, I am in love. Ifaith, you smile.
What age, what sex, or what profession,
Divine or human, from the man that cries
For alms in the highway to him that sings
At the high altar, and doth sacrifice,
Can truly say he knows not what is love?

It is a pity that the whole of the play is not as well adapted for family reading as this scene. On the principle that *les absents ont toujours tort*, *Miranda* is put aside for *Gomera* when the Grand Master declares his sister shall marry. Hereupon a wicked knight, a Frenchman named *Mountferrol*, having a design against *Oriana's* person, and desiring to prevent her marriage with *Gomera*, charges her with treason. *Gomera* challenges *Mountferrol*, and a regular trial by battle is appointed. *Oriana* dressed in white goes up a scaffold hung with black, and delivers a speech beginning

Thus I ascend nearer, I hope, to Heaven—

by which a gifted actress might make an indelible impression on her audience. Then follows the combat, in which *Gomera* fights as champion of *Oriana* against *Miranda*, who has assumed *Mountferrol's* arms. In the result *Gomera* claims the lady as having won, and *Miranda* claims her as having intentionally lost the fight. The Grand Master decides that *Gomera* shall marry *Oriana*, and that *Miranda* shall be wedded to the Order. The subsequent part of the play is hardly suitable to modern taste. *Miranda*, although he accepts the Grand Master's decision, cannot wholly relinquish his passion for *Oriana*, and, being accidentally thrown into her company, an impressive scene occurs:—

Sit, brightest *Oriana*! Is it sin
Still to profess I love you, still to vow
I shall do ever?

And after some debate she answers:—

Miranda's deeds
Have been as white as *Oriana's* fame,
From the beginning to this point of time;
And shall we now begin to stain both thus?
Think on the legend which we too shall breed,
Continuing as we are, for chaste dams
And boldest soldiers to peruse and read—
Ay, and read through, free from any act
To cause the modest cast the book away,
And the most honour'd captain fold it up.

We certainly prefer this old legend of *Oriana* to the new one which has been produced at the Globe Theatre. Wherever else Mr. Albery may have resorted for his story, he is certainly guiltless of any inspiration from Beaumont and Fletcher's play. Indeed the effeminate character of King Raymond is as far as possible removed from the bold types of vice in which the old dramatists delighted. It may be ascribed partly to the author and partly to the actor that we feel convinced that it can matter only in the smallest possible degree whether the King or the Queen wearing the King's armour leads the Royal troops. It would be unfortunate if an actor capable of better things should become identified with a class of character which no skill in delineation could preserve from liability to contempt. The attempt of Mr. Albery in an entirely new line commands rather sympathy than applause. In spite of all that can be said in praise of *Oriana*, its permanent success is doubtful. At the same time it is an undeniable novelty, and is well acted and prettily put upon the stage. If the author had designedly made a story which goes back to the age of fairies a vehicle for satire on modern life, he would probably have more fully elaborated the character of the demagogue *Oxeye*. But his work is very good as far as it goes. There is much natural humour in the rustic maid of mature years, *Chloe*, who is willing to marry a king, but would like a monarch of domestic habits who would clean himself and put on his crown when he comes home from work. There are many pretty lines effectively delivered in this play, but the whole result is somewhat disappointing, and we should think that the promise of Mr. Montague's reappearance in *Tears! idle Tears!* is likely at no distant period to be fulfilled. No doubt the groups and accessories of *Oriana* are pretty, but if you come to that *Babil* and *Bijou* must have nearly killed any theatre that would depend upon that prettiness which appeals merely to the eye. The diversions of King Raymond in the forest rather remind one of those Eastern princes who are said to divide their time between dancing-girls and narcotics.

It is said that any form of advertisement is useful to a theatre, and it is to be hoped that that most expensive form of advertisement, a trial in a court of law, will be found proportionately profitable. A good while ago it was rumoured at the West End of London that one of the best things out was *Genevieve de Brabant* at the Philharmonic Theatre. Thereupon arose the question, "Where is the Philharmonic Theatre?" and vague suggestions to coachmen to steer a north-east course were the answer. Glimpses of an unknown world have been obtained by visitors to the Cattle Show, and it would appear that this theatre is regarded by some of those who know it best as being as distant from the Strand as Ancient Britain was from Rome. We believe that adventurous residents in the Temple have been known to go in cabs to the Philharmonic Theatre and to return; but a recent discussion makes it doubtful whether there is any postal or newspaper intercourse between the

two neighbourhoods. It has been stated that a principal performer at the Philharmonic having ceased, on medical certificate, to appear, the interval of leisure thus obtained was utilized for an appearance at the Gaiety. The proprietor, having closed his house, would have been able to devote his leisure to the perusal of a very interesting book called *Other Worlds than Ours*. He was assured that it was a good thing for him that his principal performer should appear at another house, but he perhaps had a lingering idea that it would be a better thing for him to keep that performer at his own house. There has been another recent trial in which a performance at the Gaiety Theatre was the subject of discussion, and some remarks which we made upon it have produced a letter from Mr. John Hollingshead, the manager, of which the material part is as follows :—

As long as the Government burdens me with a Lord Chamberlain, I must decline to take any moral responsibility in connexion with the plays produced at my theatre. I paid two guineas, the official fee, to the Official Censor of plays for his official certificate of purity as regards *Shilly Shally*.

It is a comfort to be able to lay the blame, if there be any, for the language of this play upon so broad a back as that of the Lord Chamberlain. It is possible that the Official Censor may not be quite as keenly alive to the possibility of words being taken in a double sense as are some frequenters of theatres. It is possible also that words which on paper look harmless may be made disagreeably significant by the manner of their delivery. It was said that the Lord Chamberlain entertained the idea of prohibiting *Nos Intimes*, but, being persuaded to go and see it himself, he found nothing but the strictest propriety in the performance. It was also said that the actors were aware that the Lord Chamberlain was coming. We should have thought that the Official Censor was intended as a protection to the public, but that the public had still the right of taking care, to the best of their power, of themselves. However, division of labour is the secret of effective work. The manager does his business, and expects the Official Censor to do his. Morality is not in the managerial department.

REVIEWS.

GEORGE SAVILE, MARQUIS OF HALIFAX.*

HISTORY has done ample justice to the Marquis of Halifax as a statesman and as a speaker. His critical faculty and temperate genius recommended him to Hume. His literary accomplishments and the practicality of his politics made him a favourite of Macaulay. The great fame of his gladiatorial triumph over Shaftesbury, when he caused the rejection of the Exclusion Bill by the House of Lords in 1688, has created an exaggerated impression of his oratory; for he was rather an able, witty, and ingenious dialectician than a moving orator. But his literary productions have met with undeserved and surprising neglect. Macaulay, who may be too partial to him as a politician, has not overrated his literary powers in saying that "his political tracts well deserve to be studied for their literary merits, and fully entitle him to a place among English classics." There has never been a collected edition of his writings, which are anything but voluminous. We read in one of the lately published letters of a young politician of promise, snatched away at the beginning of a hopeful career (Mr. Edward Denison), that, wishing to study Halifax, for whom Macaulay had inspired him with admiration, he had "long sought in vain to get hold of his writings, which are few and scarce." Halifax published nothing but small prose essays, and most of them were essays on political subjects of the day. But the political subjects which he chose were of prime importance, and his political essays are always far above the level of party pamphlets, general in their treatment of occasional topics, free from passion and personality, and full of reason and of wit. They are the condensed and sparkling productions of an accomplished and thoughtful man, who is also a man of the world and a man of action. In the last years of the reign of Charles II. Halifax was at the head of a third party, which stood between Whigs and Tories, and which was nicknamed Trimmer. He was as strong as Shaftesbury against Popery, but he preferred maintaining the regular succession to the throne with limitations of a Popish successor to exclusion of the Duke of York. He believed as strongly as Shaftesbury in Titus Oates; but he was not satisfied with the evidence against Lord Stafford, and he voted him not guilty. In his little treatise, "The Character of a Trimmer," Halifax took up in pride the name thrown at him in derision, and vindicated the middle way philosophically, historically, and practically. "If men are together in a boat," he said, "and one part of the company would weigh it down on one side, another would make it lean as much to the contrary, it happens there is a third opinion of those who conceive it would do as well if the boat went even without endangering the passengers." His uncle, Sir William Coventry, a very distinguished Parliamentary man, was also a Trimmer, and gave a

similar account of his party; to Coventry, indeed, rumour ascribed the authorship of Halifax's work; but this he has denied, avowing himself to be a Trimmer in the sense of "one who would sit upright, and not overturn the boat by swaying too much on either side." There was another way which Halifax adopted of justifying a Trimmer as pursuing the happy mean between two extremes; and the conclusion of the treatise has been paraphrased by Macaulay in brilliant sentences, but in no way improved :—

Our Trimmer thinks fit to conclude with these assertions; that our Climate is a Trimmer between that part of the world where men are roasted, and the other where they are frozen; that our Church is a Trimmer between the phrenzy of Platonic visions and the lethargic ignorance of Popish dreams; that our Laws are Trimmers between the excess of unbounded power and the extravagance of liberty not enough restrained; that true Virtus has ever been thought a Trimmer, and to have its dwelling in the middle between the two extremes; that even God Almighty himself is divided between his two great Attributes, his Mercy and his Justice. In such company our Trimmer is not ashamed of his name, and willingly leaves to the bold champions of either extreme the honour of contending with no less adversaries than Nature, Religion, Prudence, Humanity, and Common Sense.

When James II. ascended the throne which he owed to Halifax, he began by humiliating his benefactor, and soon rudely dismissed him from office. Though Halifax had turned the scale against the Exclusion Bill, he was firm against Popery and arbitrary government. James early made known his intention of obtaining the repeal of all tests and penal laws against Roman Catholics, and, if he could not obtain the repeal, of acting as if they were repealed. In James's subsequent endeavours to gain his end by promising compensation or "an equivalent" to Churchmen, and by cajoling the Dissenters into coalition with the Roman Catholics against the Church, Halifax put forth his literary energies in two consummately skilful tracts. In "The Anatomy of an Equivalent" he brought wide reasoning and large illustration to bear on the impossibility of treating on equal terms with a King or securing his observance of a treaty; and, having explained what circumstances were necessary for making a good bargain, and for ensuring an equivalent, pithily concluded that, "where distrust may be the cause of provoking anger, and trusting may be the cause of bringing ruin, the choice is too easy to need being explained." Of the "Letter to a Dissenter," published after James's Proclamation of Indulgence, published anonymously, and at first generally attributed to Temple, twenty thousand copies are said to have been distributed immediately by post. The effect was prodigious in rallying the Protestant Dissenters to the support of the law and contemptuous rejection of benefits offered, not in justice or in kindness, but to aid the advancement of Popery. But Halifax, firmly opposed to James's policy and acts, was very slow to espouse the cause of William and revolution. His long hesitation increased his power when he at last threw his weight into the scale against James. He was made Speaker of the Lords in the Convention Parliament, and was the hero of the Revolution, as eight years before he had been the hero of anti-exclusion. To him was assigned the great duty of tendering the crown to William and Mary in the name of all the Estates of England. In the formation of the new Administration he was restored to the office of Lord Privy Seal. For nine months he was virtually Prime Minister, for in those days ostensible Prime Minister there was none. Harassed by the toils and cares of arduous office, having sustained and by great exertions vanquished a bitter persecution in Parliament, borne down also by private sorrows (for he had lately lost in quick succession two sons, and he was the tenderest of fathers), he retired in October 1689 from his post of Speaker of the House of Lords, and soon after resigned the Privy Seal. For his wise and well-balanced mind power and dignities had never had engrossing charms; greatness had always followed, rather than been sought by him; and the exercise of his fine intellectual faculties supplied diversion and employment in quiet retreat at his loved estate of Rufford. He remained a diligent observer of political events, and his pen was from time to time employed on politics. On the eve of the general election of 1690 he issued his "Cautions for the Choice of Members in Parliament"; they are admirably terse and witty. Naval disasters and Admiralty mismanagement, the frequent subjects of Parliamentary debates, provoked him into writing "A New Draught of a Model at Sea," in which he strongly argued for Tarpaulins against gentlemen as officers—men bred to the sea and trained by service against persons of quality who went in for amusement and for profit. An extract from this little treatise is a good illustration of the wit and wisdom and apophthegmatic manner of his political essays :—

Mankind naturally swelleth against favour and partiality; their belief of their own merit maketh men object them to a prosperous competitor, even when there is no pretence for it; but when there is the least handle offered, to be sure it will be taken. So in this case, when a gentleman is preferred at sea, the Tarpaulin is very apt to impute it to friend or favour; but if that gentleman hath before his preferment passed through all the steps which lead to it, that he smelleth as much of pitch and tar as those that were swaddled in sail cloth, his having an escutcheon will be so far from doing him harm that it will set him upon the advantage ground; it will draw a real respect to his quality when so supported, and give him an influence and authority infinitely superior to that which the mere seaman can ever pretend to.

When a gentleman hath learned how to obey, he will grow very much fitter to command; his own memory will advise him not to inflict too rigorous punishments. He will better resist the temptations of authority, which are great, when he reflecteth how much he hath at other times wished it might be gently exercised, when he was liable to the rigour of it.

When the undistinguished discipline of a ship hath tamed the young

* *Miscellanies*. By the late Lord Marquis of Halifax. London. 1704.

A Character of King Charles II., and Political, Moral, and Miscellaneous Thoughts and Reflections. By George Savile, Marquis of Halifax. London. 1750.

Savile Correspondence. Letters of Henry Savile, Esq., &c., &c., including Letters from his brother George, Marquis of Halifax. Edited by W. D. Cooper, F.S.A. Printed for the Camden Society. London. 1853.

mastership, which is apt to arise from a gentleman's birth and education, he then growth proud in the right place, and valueth himself first upon knowing his duty, and then upon doing it.

To expect that quality alone should waft men up into places and employments is as unreasonable as to think that a ship, because it is carved and gilded, should be fit to go to sea without sails or tackling. But when a gentleman maketh no other use of his quality than to incite him the more to his duty, it will give such a true and settled superiority as must destroy all competition from those that are below him.

This is wisdom for all time, and even now this preaching would not be altogether useless. Halifax's mind was peculiarly fitted for apophthegms.

We have now exhausted the list of his political essays. There are others of a general character. The "Maxims of State," and the "Political, Moral, and Miscellaneous Thoughts and Reflections," are collections of aphorisms of which it is not too much to say that they combine the wisdom of Bacon with the wit of Rochefoucault. We give a few instances at hazard:—"The Court may be said to be a Company of well-bred fashionable beggars." "A man had as good go to bed with a razor as to be intimate with a foolish friend." "Men should do with their hopes as they do with tame fowl, cut their wings that they may not fly over the wall." "Anger is never without an argument, but seldom with a good one." "It is a self-flattering contradiction that wise men despise the opinion of fools and yet are proud of having their esteem." It would be expected that such a writer as this would be skilful in perception and description of character. His character of Charles II., and another of Bishop Burnet, are delightful delineations, acute as can be, true and yet kindly. Burnet's son, who published Halifax's sketch of his father, says that Halifax had himself given it in his own handwriting to the Bishop; and Lord Dartmouth has ill-naturedly suggested that Halifax was accustomed to ridicule and criticize Burnet in conversation, and that the sketch was more probably written by Burnet himself. But the humorous Halifax might in private dwell on Burnet's faults and foibles, while, in writing a sketch of his character which was to remain, he would be careful to do full justice to the substantial virtues and merits of the vain and bustling, but excellent and true-hearted, Bishop. It remains to mention—and we have no space to do more than mention—Halifax's "Advice to a Daughter"—the advice of a kind, clever, and sensible father, full of practical wisdom, and free from cant and exaggeration. The daughter, Lady Elizabeth, to whom this advice was addressed, became mother of the famous Earl of Chesterfield, whose worldly-wise lessons to his son are well known.

Halifax died at the age of sixty-two, in 1695. He had been a leading statesman and Minister in three reigns. It is known that he made a diary from which he wrote out memoirs of his time. There has been a story that two copies only of these memoirs existed, and that both were burnt, one by the Earl of Nottingham, the father of the wife of Halifax's eldest son and successor, and the second by his granddaughter, the Countess of Burlington acting under the advice of Pope, who had read the memoirs and found them very unfavourable to the Roman Catholics. It was, however, positively stated in 1781 by Mr. Tyers, the author of *Political Conferences*, that the original diary was, with the Duke of Shrewsbury's papers, in the hands of Robertson the historian for use; and it has been further stated lately, in 1858, on the authority of Mr. J. Payne Collier, that the diary had been seen some years before in the Duke of Devonshire's library. It is strange that by this time the question of the existence of this diary should not have been settled. It is time that it should be, and it is to be presumed that the present Duke of Devonshire will be eager to give every facility for the discovery of so precious an historical document. The Duke descends from Halifax's granddaughter, Dorothy Countess of Burlington, the lady accused of burning her copy of the memoirs. An able or more interesting diarist of public affairs cannot be conceived. What letters of his have been published are charming in style, frank, acute, and lively. His correspondence with Henry Savile, his brother, not long since published by the Camden Society, presents a delightful picture of fraternal friendship. He was much loved by his relations. His mother-in-law, the clever Countess of Sunderland, Dorothy Sydney, the sister of Algernon, raved in admiration of him. His fine temper and exuberant wit made him a charming companion. His wit gave him a strong hold in council on Charles II.; it was thrown away on James and on William. He had a humorous way of treating every subject, which was not discreet with all, and which often gave him the character of levity. On a memorable occasion he was the triumphant champion of the royal succession, but he was known privately to speak lightly of hereditary monarchy, asking, "Who takes a coachman to drive him because his father was a good coachman?" He gave serious offence to Danby by burlesquing a piece of evidence intended to favour him, which was to the effect that a bribe had been offered him and he had civilly declined it, saying that it would be strange if a man should ask another for the use of his wife and the latter refuse, but with great civility. Burnet twitted him with his love of titles, for from a baronet he was made successively baron, earl, and marquis. His ready reply was that, if the world were such fools as to value those matters, a man must be fool for company; he considered them but as rattles, yet rattles please children, and these titles would be of use to his family. So he wrote seriously to his brother Henry, when he was made an earl, that he valued the promotion because it might bring a better match for his son when he was called Lord Eland than if he were

only Mr. Savile, and went so gravely into the point of marriage prospects as to argue that Lord Eland was a better title than Lord Savile, as Lady Savile might be mistaken for the wife of a knight. He was a free-thinker in religion; he did not profess to be a saint, and was not a hypocrite; and he pleasantly replied to Burnet's professional admonitions that he hoped that God would not lay it to his charge if he could not digest iron as an ostrich did, nor take into his belief things that would burst him. A Life of Halifax should be written as well as a collected edition of his works published. In many respects there has been a very great resemblance to him in a recent statesman, one of the most interesting of our Prime Ministers, Viscount Melbourne—in literary taste and accomplishment, in wit, in a speculative and analytical turn of mind, in a *laissez-faire* disposition, in moderation, in fine temper, equanimity, and worldly skill; but both Lord Melbourne and Lord Halifax were rather fitted for the delight of friends and to please refined minds than to lead a party or move a nation, and were subtle and dainty rather than vigorous politicians.

HULL'S BUILDING AND ORNAMENTAL STONES.*

THERE has long been felt the want of a good book upon building and ornamental stones. A certain amount of information upon the nature and varieties of this class of natural products has of course been available in ordinary treatises on geology, besides being scattered up and down in many of the existing works on architecture, masonry, and engineering, such as Gwilt's and Cresy's Cyclopedias, as well as in manifold Transactions and technical serials. But little has been hitherto done in a complete manner, or with much attempt at scientific arrangement. The admirable *Technologie du Bâtiment*, by M. T. Chateau, is full of correct details of the nature and uses of such materials, especially as they are found in France, as is also the valuable work of B. von Cotta, of which an English version has appeared entitled *Rocks Classified and Arranged*. A good model of the kind of work required has been supplied for the sister island in the *Ancient Architecture and Practical Geology of Ireland*, by Mr. G. Wilkinson, M.R.I.A., &c. Had the author of this excellent work extended its scope so as to comprise the resources of the British islands, and the more important building materials of other lands, there would have been no need, Mr. Hull feels conscious, for the treatise he has lately put forth upon the *Building and Ornamental Stones of Great Britain and Foreign Countries*. This work, obviously compiled with care, and based upon the writer's wide and accurate study of the rocks as Director of the Geological Survey of Ireland, and Professor of Geology in the Royal College of Science in Dublin, is fitted in a great measure to fill the void thus-existing. It took its rise, we are given to understand, in the author's design of delivering a series of lectures, with the assent of the Council of the College, during the evenings of 1870-71. Circumstances occurred to prevent the delivery of the course, but with the collection and arrangement of his materials the subject grew in interest, until it at length developed itself into the form in which it is now presented to the reader.

A preliminary difficulty in seeking for a scientific as well as a practical basis for a work of this kind was felt by the writer to lie in the absence of a generally received mode of classification of rocks, and a system of nomenclature founded both upon origin and composition. The microscope has of late years been turned to greater account even than chemical tests for determining the ultimate structure of rock masses. Truer views are thus gradually being formed regarding the basis of classification, and such distinctions as those between igneous and metamorphic rocks. In his introductory observations Mr. Hull rightly expresses his preference for the system of Durocher and Bunsen, who make the proportion of silica the basis of classification, over that of Dr. Zirkel, who makes it dependent upon the varieties of felspar. It is far easier, he argues, in analysing the structure of rocks, to judge of the comparative richness or deficiency in silica than of the nature of their felspathic bases. The analysis of a large number and variety of deposits led Durocher to the conclusion that the basic rocks, which are poor in silica, have been derived from a deeper *magma* or envelope within the earth than that of the acidic or highly silicated rocks. Silica he somewhat fancifully considers to hold the same essential place among the rocks that carbon does among the products of vegetation. As a practical matter, at all events, the division of both eruptive and sedimentary rocks into basic and acidic is as good a one as our author could have adopted, although no sharp line of demarcation can be made to separate the subordinate classes of stone which come under these primary characteristics.

Of the igneous and metamorphic class, which naturally head the series, as they form the earliest and most fundamental elements of the earth's structure, the group which stands first as the acidic or most highly silicated is of course that of the granites. True granite, as understood by petrologists, is defined as a rock of a crystalline granular texture, igneous or metamorphic in its origin, made up of at least three constituents—quartz, felspar, and mica. It is often found as a quaternary compound, from the occurrence of two felspars (orthoclase and oligoclase, or orthoclase and albite), or two micas; less frequently as a quinary. When containing

* *A Treatise on the Building and Ornamental Stones of Great Britain and Foreign Countries, arranged according to their Geological Distribution and Mineral Character.* By Edward Hull, M.A., F.R.S., Director of the Geological Survey of Ireland, &c. London: Macmillan & Co. 1872.

large and distinct crystals of felspar, it is known as porphyritic granite, and when presenting a foliated structure and thus verging into gneiss, it is called foliated granite. When the mica disappears and the rock is finely crystalline-granular, it is known as eurite. Syenite, which is often popularly confounded with granite, is a ternary compound of quartz, felspar, and hornblende. When the free silica in the quartz disappears, the rock passes into diorite, where, in addition to quartz, felspar, and mica, hornblende appears. As Mr. Hull instances, in part of the Sleeve Croob range, County Down, this quaternary compound is called syenitic granite. In the analytical tables compiled by our author, the proportion of silica varies from 65.81 per cent., or even 62.08, according to Dr. Haughton, to 81.77, in the case of the Teufelsmauer, near Krems, as determined by Dr. Zirkel. From the fact of the felspar and flakes of mica being visibly embedded in the free silica (or quartz), it has been inferred that the silica, being the most difficult to fuse, was the last to solidify, retaining a certain degree of viscosity after the other minerals had assumed the crystalline form. The action of water in the deposition of granite has been suspected of late to a degree unthought of while these rocks were referred to a purely igneous origin. Where silica is found in great excess, instead of having been injected volcanically into the veins which traverse the granitic rocks, it may have been deposited, Dr. Sterry Hunt and others have held, from aqueous solution. Minute cells containing water having been observed under the microscope in the quartz of granite, Mr. Sorby and Dr. Zirkel have inferred the presence of steam under great pressure and a high temperature during the process of deposition. From the proportions of watery fluid in the cavities of various specimens, Mr. Sorby has even sought to reach certain conclusions as to the relative depths at which these granite beds have been formed. Thus the granites of the Scottish Highlands indicate a pressure of 26,000 feet of superincumbent rocks above those of Cornwall, the evans or granitic dykes of the Highlands one of 28,700 feet above those of Cornwall. But these pressures, as Mr. Hull remarks, depend in part upon the temperatures of consolidation. Although, on the whole, underlying all other rocks, granite is by no means to be limited to one, and that the remotest, age. It is known to have been formed at several geological epochs, from the Silurian down to at least the close of the Cretaceous period. The granites of Cornwall and Devon are instanced by Mr. Hull as being more recent than the Carboniferous period, those of the Alps of Savoy later than the Jurassic, and those of the Eastern Pyrenees than the age of the White Chalk. In these more recent instances it may be conceived to have been in part erupted amongst strata occupying a higher zone, after undergoing fusion or metamorphic action in the interior of the earth's crust; in part also, as suggested by Professor Haughton, formed under fusion and immense pressure from sedimentary rocks such as grits and slates or shales. This careful enumeration of the granites, not only of the British Isles, but of Europe in general, Egypt, and North of the American Continent, makes clear in most cases the relation of these rocks to the stratified beds by which granite is bounded or enclosed, as well as the mineral constituents and other characteristics of each variety, and its adaptation to building purposes, by virtue of its texture, cohesion, and durability under different conditions of climate.

The historic instances which Mr. Hull has brought together illustrate the use of this material from the earliest times, and serve to throw much light upon the causes which affect its permanence. The syenites of Egypt, both red and grey, imperishable in their all but rainless climate, their age running back to four thousand years at least, have not been found when transported to more humid climates to retain anything like the same quality of durability. Such specimens exist in the monoliths of the Piazza of St. Mark, Venice, brought, it is said, from Tyre by the Doge Michielli in A.D. 1127; some of those of the portico of St. Peter's and the columns of the Pantheon at Rome, and the obelisk of Luxor in the Place de la Concorde, Paris. In all these, comparatively less humid as the climate is than our own, the progress of weathering may be observed to mark an approximation to the period of their exposure. Amongst ourselves we have only to look to the numerous examples of quite modern date which meet the eye for proof of the rapid disintegration to which this material, notwithstanding its hardness of texture and the polish of its surface, is subject in an atmosphere alternately wet and dry, especially when laden, as in London and the greater towns, with carbonic acid and other products of the consumption of coal. Nor does the durability of granite under the action of fire come up to the standard which Mr. Hull is disposed to assign to it in that important particular, if we may judge from the reports of the great fire at Boston. What most struck our builders and architects in that terrible catastrophe was the rapid way in which massive walls of granite crumbled and disintegrated, when limestones, sandstones, and brick stood comparatively scathless, or even vitrified and became harder under the flame. For hydraulic works, such as docks and sea walls, for the most part permanently under water, and consisting of broad masses, granite is in its most appropriate place. In situations alternately exposed to air and water, or calling for broken or angular surfaces, its granular texture no less than its chemical composition renders it less fit. Under climatic conditions of much moisture in combination with sulphurous, hydrochloric, and other acids, limestones and dolomites are even more subject to disintegration; witness St. Mary Redcliffe, Bristol, Henry VII.'s Chapel, and the Houses of Parliament, Westminster. In the last-named instance much of the mischief was traceable to the want

of care in passing none but the harder strata at the quarry—a fault, like many others in connexion with that much-abused pile, due, there is no doubt, to a senseless parsimony on the part of the higher authorities concerned. Upon the importance of care in this respect, as well as in regard to the proper bedding of the masonry, judicious remarks will be found in Mr. Hull's pages. For wet and smoky climates, such as our architects and builders have in the main to provide for, he insists upon the superiority of the siliceous sandstones, formed of grains of quartz cemented together by a siliceous or felspathic paste. Such rocks are widely distributed amongst the Lower Carboniferous formations of Scotland, the North of England and Wales, made up of the disintegrated gneissic and granitic beds which formed the land at the period of deposition. Being all but destitute of carbonate of lime or magnesia, they are able to defy the action of the acids which pervade the atmosphere of our manufacturing towns in those districts, and are found practically indestructible. There is, indeed, Mr. Hull remarks, in the natural distribution of building stones a noteworthy suitability to the wants of each district. Thus, amongst the mining and manufacturing regions of mid-Scotland, and the North and centre of England, siliceous substances are plentifully developed in the Carboniferous and Triassic formations, while the soft calcareous stones of the Jurassic or Oolitic series are distributed amongst the comparatively smokeless and less watery districts of the South and East. It is at the same time in the numerous exceptions to this rule that the necessity of a guide like the present is felt, in order to supplement what nature has left deficient. Of instances like these none can be thought more conspicuous than that of slate, to which our author devotes a prominent and instructive chapter. Few materials are so limited in the range of their distribution, while few are of such general or varied necessity for both building and other purposes. In the British Isles cleaved slates are confined to the Palaeozoic formations, from the Cambrian down to the Carboniferous, inclusive. On the Continent it is otherwise. Both in the Pyrenees, the Alps, and Apennines strata belonging to the Mesozoic and even Tertiary periods present the phenomenon of cleavage, which is altogether independent of geological age. In a valuable synopsis Mr. Hull brings together the various slate formations of Great Britain and Ireland, with analyses of their chemical composition, strength, power of resistance to weather, and similar points of importance to the practical builder. The special attention of capitalists is directed to the Lower Silurian rocks north of Hillary Harbour, and along the valleys of the Erriff and Doo Lough, County Mayo, where there are certain beds which, if opened up at sufficient depth, might be found to yield excellent pale grey or blueish roofing slate.

The class of marbles seems likely in this country to be limited in the main to purposes of ornament rather than of construction. Still, as an all-important accessory to the arts, it is not to be held less worthy of consideration than substances of more utilitarian scope. The marbles of Devonshire, Derbyshire, and Sussex, those of Anglesea, the Isle of Man, Scotland, and Ireland, various in their texture and their hues, stand fairly well in contrast with the variegated products of other European quarries. It is in the pure and lustrous blocks which supply the art of the sculptor that Italy and Greece still maintain the monopoly they have had since the rise of the finer forms of statuary. Mr. Hull has to speak of promising specimens having been obtained from Ardes, in Donegal, where the bands of limestone are found converted into crystalline marble in proximity with the granite. But it remains uncertain how far these beds may prove sufficiently homogeneous and pure for statuary purposes. From the reports which have reached us, we should be inclined to look with more hope to the partially explored beds of New Zealand. We do not perceive that our author's attention has been drawn to the mineral resources of our Southern dependencies at large, though he does not fail to do justice to the magnificent yield of malachite which has distinguished the Burra Burra mines. In Canada the crystalline limestones of the Laurentian series yield marbles pure enough for decorative purposes, but not for statuary. They are quarried at Calumet Falls, on the Ottawa, Portage du Fort, and Fitzroy Harbour. Large and fine blocks are obtained from Elzevir and Marmora, and the statuary marble from Burrie would, we are assured, scarcely yield to that from Carrara, were it not marred by occasional grains and specks of tremolite and quartz. White marble is met with among the metamorphic schists of Five Islands, Nova Scotia, together with coloured serpentinous varieties. In the United States, where marble is so plentiful as to form a common building material, there is little that is not more or less striated or clouded. The finest statuary marble spoken of by Mr. Hull comes from Stoneham, but seldom in blocks of any size. Among the themes of most recent interest to petrographers and lovers of art, the most prominent perhaps is the introduction, or rather rediscovery, of the quarries in Algeria whence the "onyx marble" was supplied of old for the decoration of Rome and Carthage. Since the reopening by M. Delmonte in 1849 of the tertiary limestones of Blad Recam ("marble country"), near the ravine of Oned-Abdallah, much attention has been directed to this beautiful material. In combination with bronze it has been made to tell with striking effect as an imitation of drapery. Translucent, faintly white, and iridescent, of uniform texture and stalagmitic in origin, it has taken its name from its superficial resemblance to onyx, which of course belongs to a different petrologic group. Nor, though long and widely known as Oriental alabaster, is it to be confounded with the alabaster of the present day. Oriental

alabaster, so called, was also largely derived from Egypt, and was employed in works of art, though not in statuary, both in ancient and early mediæval times. Its mammillated structure, characteristic of filtration and percolation, combines with its arrangement in folds or wavy parallel bands of amber or yellowish brown to indicate its stalagmitic origin. Besides numerous smaller examples of the antique, chiefly mortuary jars or canopi from Egypt, large and splendid cinerary urns of this material are in the museums of Florence and Naples, the finest of all being that in the Vatican Museum at Rome, measuring nine feet in height and four in depth. Writing in the interests of science or practical utility rather than of the fine arts, it is not Mr. Hull's business to go deeply or systematically into the history or the æsthetic value of the works which have come down to us in stone, although he has given us a number of interesting facts relating to the material in use at various stages of art, or characteristic of different schools. As a matter of taste many might demur to his speaking somewhat slightly of the *Venus de' Medici*, and giving apparently to the *Farnese Bull* the palm of supremacy in sculpture. Of his classical attainments we should be very sorry to judge from his allusion to the conquering goddess of the Acropolis as *Athene "Nyke,"* nor have we much to say from a literary point of view of the grace or polish of his style. Keeping in sight, however, the scope and object of his book, we have to thank him for a great deal of valuable information, collected with great industry and pervaded with much accurate research and special knowledge.

NEVER AGAIN.*

WE might very easily have thrown this novel aside without serious attention. Its outward form is by no means attractive. The illustrations with which it is very needlessly provided are amongst the worst which it has ever been our fortune to encounter. Moreover we must confess that the names which meet us upon turning over the pages are calculated to prejudice us against the story. It may be said by severely rational critics that the system of nomenclature adopted by a novelist is of little importance for artistic purposes. And yet when we find that some of the leading performers in the little drama are called *Hamilton Boggs*, *Whoppers*, *Stichen*, and *Ledgeral*, we are affected by an involuntary prejudice. We are inclined to jump to the conclusion that the story is one more imitation of Dickens; and though Dickens was a man of genius, it is so much easier to catch his mannerisms than to acquire some of his really excellent qualities, that we are not prepossessed in favour of any one marked by these external signs of his school. However, we have read *Never Again* in spite of these unfavourable symptoms; and we may freely confess that we have been encouraged to undertake the task by the very emphatic praises of some of our contemporaries. One literary journal informs us that it will in future remember the name of Dr. Mayo "as that of one of the wittiest of modern writers, and greatest of living masters of human character." This is tolerably strong language; but it is confirmed by another journal of equal critical pretensions. Though the writer in this case gives a rather more modest estimate of *Never Again*, he nevertheless compares Dr. Mayo to Dickens and to Thackeray, and seems to give him in some respects the preference. *Never Again*, we are assured, is "a perfect mine of good sayings," and though everybody says good things, nobody speaks out of character. Such glowing eulogies, which have naturally been quoted in various advertisements, warned us that we might be receiving an angel unaware. Dr. Mayo, it seems, is the author of a book called *Kaloodah*, of which we have been hitherto ignorant, and we suspect that our ignorance is shared by most of our readers. As it appeared some twenty-five years ago, Dr. Mayo's claim to be a second Thackeray or Dickens should by this time have either been confirmed or confuted; and as we were scarcely conscious that any such author had ever existed, we might naturally assume that he was after all no literary phoenix. On seeing such enthusiastic praises, however, we called to mind the cases of Keats and Wordsworth, and remembered that critics are after all fallible, especially when they allow themselves to be prejudiced by first appearances. Accordingly we have read *Never Again* conscientiously from the first page to the last; we have endeavoured to make up our minds as to its merits with the most conscientious fairness, and we are prepared to deliver our verdict. As, however, we do not entirely agree with the very warm eulogies which we have quoted, we think it only fair to mention the fact that other critics are more enthusiastic than ourselves, and, to enable our readers to judge for themselves, we will quote one of the passages which have been singled out for our admiration. Here is a fragment intended to show us that Dr. Mayo possesses "the most astounding acquaintance with all the ins and outs of human meanness":—

Yes, Stichen was dead! and he had the finest funeral that had been seen in a long time. The sententious sexton of Grace Church was heard to say that it was a pity he hadn't lasted till Lent. Such an agreeable funeral would have come in so nicely to relieve the gloom of the season when balls and weddings are prohibited by—fashion, he was going to say, but he caught himself in time and said—the Church. Stichen's funeral was magnificent—so magnificent that the idea occurred to more than one of the pall-bearers (all men of mark, nothing under a bank-president) that it was a pity he couldn't come to, just for a few minutes, to enjoy it.

* *Never Again.* By W. J. Mayo, M.D. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1873.

Does this passage show any remarkable powers of delicate sarcasm, or is it on the whole rather commonplace? As selected by a fervent admirer, we presume that it must be taken for a fine specimen of Dr. Mayo's humour. We shall not undertake the responsibility of pronouncing upon it; though we may venture to say that, in our opinion, there are some better passages to be found in the recognized masters of English humour. However, we admit that it is scarcely fair to judge of a clever writer by a fragment separated from its context, even though the person who selects it be one of the discriminating few. And therefore we will proceed to give our own view of Dr. Mayo's merits, simply observing that other persons see more in him than we can profess to do; and further admitting that we are fallible.

In the first place, then, we will venture to say that extravagant eulogies seem to us to be very unfair to Dr. Mayo. The puff direct is not so desirable as some young authors may fancy. When one has been assured that the last new poet is equal to Shakespeare, and the last new novelist to Thackeray or Balzac, we are apt to be cruelly disappointed on turning to the writer himself, and to avenge ourselves upon him by lowering him as much beneath his true level as others have exalted him above it. We protest involuntarily against very daring claims upon our enthusiasm. And, glad as we should be to assure our readers that a Transatlantic novelist had arisen worthy to provide a successor to *Middlemarch*, we are a little amazed by the sudden shock of discovering that the new performer does not attract us so forcibly as we had been led to expect. We will, however, try to dismiss these irrelevant considerations, and to judge *Never Again* as we should have judged it had we been the first discoverers of this American treasure. And when we have thus placed ourselves at the proper point of view, we have no hesitation in saying that *Never Again* is really a meritorious book; though not, in our opinion, destined to set the Thames or the Hudson on fire. We have no fault to find with Dr. Mayo except that he does not reach that standard by which the extravagant eulogies lavished upon his writings might lead us to measure him. He is not a first-rate performer; and indeed we should be disposed to say that he is not second-rate; but *Never Again*, though rather long, and though much of it is decidedly tiresome, may be read with interest by any one who does not expect too much. Dr. Mayo himself appears to be a perfectly modest as well as a clever writer; he does not, even by implication, put forward any exorbitant claims; but he tries to follow the footsteps of Balzac and Thackeray in describing the society of New York instead of the society of Paris or London. He has not, we may say at once, the faculty which is characteristic of the higher class of novelists. There is no character of much originality or excellence throughout his pages. There is a tolerably long list of persons very fairly described, and, we dare say, very respectable portraits of existing people in New York. But none of them show the unmistakable mark of genius even in a moderate degree. The lover is one of the lads, more common at the present day in America than in England, who come up from a country district with the conventional half-crown in their pockets. Luther Lansdale—that is his name—luckily falls on his legs by an introduction to a rich merchant in New York, and ends, after due vicissitudes, by becoming the merchant's partner and marrying his beautiful daughter. But Luther, though introduced with a considerable flourish of trumpets and intended to excite our warmest sympathies, is in no respect a remarkable young man. In fact, he is simply the conventional lover of ordinary novels, and the object of his admiration is like unto him. There is a captain of a merchantman who lards his conversation to an intolerable extent with nautical metaphors, and an editor of a New York newspaper who has an equally marked propensity for execrable puns, and a fashionable young man who talks the slang of New York society; and we must confess that the hero, and the captain, and the editor, and the man of fashion all seem to us to be remarkably alike at bottom. There is a little more of special idiosyncrasy about the merchant who is tempted to cheat in order to save himself from ruin, and the eccentric old gentleman who discourses upon queer theories borrowed from Darwin and Herbert Spencer; and yet the most striking peculiarity of all these persons is their strong family resemblance.

Perhaps this is due to the American character. Philosophers of the Tocqueville kind are always assuring us that in democracies men become more and more like each other; and the novelist certainly has a difficulty in discovering those materials for picturesque description which are provided by the varieties of European society. It is equally true, indeed, that there is a good deal of human nature on both sides of the Atlantic. Dr. Mayo finds as much opportunity for satirizing snobbishness amongst his countrymen as we could find in England. American snobbishness, indeed, has a character of its own, arising from the peculiar conditions of the country. Popular orators here talk a good deal of nonsense about American equality; and, on the other hand, English describers of American manners are apt to express a very unreasonable surprise on discovering that unworthy subserviency to fashion and struggling for social eminence are common even in democratic Republic. The truth of the matter is obvious enough. An American gentleman is as much revolted by coarseness and ignorance as his English parallel. Unluckily or luckily, as the case may be, he cannot defend himself by the same means. There are not such distinct lines of social demarcation as with us. Poor men, as Dr. Mayo shows us by example, are constantly

making fortunes, and rich men sinking to be poor. There is an ascending and a descending current which tends to obliterate all fixed lines. It therefore becomes necessary for the more refined classes to form a tacit combination for keeping the less refined at arm's length. They cannot rely upon those obvious signs of hereditary cultivation which divide the different strata of society here; but they are all the more anxious to keep up a distinction by less openly avowed means. The raw Irishman in America treads upon the toes of the descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers or the old Dutch families on railways and at hotels; his vote is as good as his neighbour's; and the road to political distinctions is equally open to him. And, for that reason, there is formed an inner circle of the "upper ten thousand," who are the more jealous of their privilege because it does not rest upon any palpable or generally recognized distinctions. The struggle to get within this hallowed circle is as keen and as favourable to the development of snobbishness as the struggle to acquire rank and social consideration in England. And thus Dr. Mayo can transfer to American conditions the same fund of satire which passes current in England with very little change of language. It is true that the difference in the conditions of the struggle produces many differences upon which we have not space to dwell. The absence of any counterbalancing power to mere wealth makes a great difference, though we may admit the truth of Dr. Mayo's doctrine, that Americans do not worship the dollar more devotedly than Englishmen worship pounds or Frenchmen francs. To trace out the various modifications of the social forces would be a task altogether beyond our space or our means of information. It is enough for the present to say that Dr. Mayo has abundant opportunities for exercising his talent for satire, and that he avails himself of them with no inconsiderable skill. The general tone of these parts of his book—and to us they are by far the most interesting—reminds us more of Dr. Holmes than of any other writer. He has the same kind of ingenious humour, and kindness mixed with keen sarcasm, and though his language has at times a decidedly foreign flavour, we can enjoy his wit, and generally sympathize with his sentiments. Altogether we find him an agreeable companion; and we could quote a good many passages which show much wit and keen powers of observation. We part with him in a very good temper, and can fairly commend him to our readers, though we do not feel convinced that he deserves all the fine things which have been said about him by our contemporaries.

SIR JOHN BURGOYNE.*

(Second Notice.)

IT would be difficult to exaggerate the interest of Burgoyne's letters from the Crimea. Remembering the senseless clamour against veterans which grew out of the disasters of the Russian war, we remark with satisfaction that whatever was at once prudent and vigorous in the operations of the Allies was either suggested or adopted by Burgoyne. Disapproving the expedition, he did more perhaps than any other man to render its success possible. He could not understand "on what sound principle it is undertaken," and he considered it "the most desperate enterprise ever attempted." He would not have been sorry if circumstances had caused it to be deferred until the next year. He dined with Marshal St. Arnaud, who said that there were *des difficultés*, but "we were gone too far; the enterprise was pressed upon us in a manner not to be resisted with honour." This is probably as true an account as could be given. "Put yourself," said the French Marshal, "in mine and Lord Raglan's position." This, as Burgoyne remarks, was the pith of the whole argument. The landing-place was chosen in accordance with Burgoyne's opinion. The battle of the Alma was fought, and "We are all," writes Burgoyne, "in high spirits at present appearances." The moral effect of the victory was worth twenty thousand additional troops. Burgoyne suggested and urged the flank march to Balaclava. Lord Raglan desired him to discuss it with Marshal St. Arnaud. All the French staff officers, including Colonel Trochu and General Bizot of the Engineers, opposed this project, and brought forward one trivial objection after another, until the Marshal broke up the conference by saying that he thought General Burgoyne was right, that difficulties which appeared great at a distance often disappeared on nearer approach, and that it was *un mouvement en avant*, and he would undertake it. The army marched accordingly, and Burgoyne thus records his first impression of Sebastopol as seen from the south. "The fortifications," he says, "are poor concerns, but the situation is favourable for the enemy. They have an immense force of artillery mounted, and a large garrison." But he hoped the operations would not take long. Two days later he says that the heavy guns and siege equipments have been landed, and dragged eight or ten miles over a mountain. This, and having to work on rocky ground, causes much delay, and he fears it will be a week yet before the walls and works will be so battered as to justify an assault. "Still, I feel that it is, as now circumstanced, an enterprise in which we ought to succeed." He adds that before that letter arrives in England he trusts there will be some decisive work. But a week later he is less hopeful. "We are in diffi-

culties," he says, "that I do not see what prospect we have of getting out of." The place was found to be surrounded by detached loopholed towers, crenelated walls, and earth bastions, with a good many guns mounted, and a tolerable garrison. The allies began and had continued landing and getting up siege guns and train, but meanwhile the enemy had introduced large reinforcements, had increased their works diligently, and mounted an enormous number of guns. The British army was immensely reduced by cholera. The infantry were not now more than 16,000 or 17,000 men, and no reinforcements to look to. Next day he writes that "it would have been unjustifiable to have stormed Sebastopol when we first arrived before it, and obstacles against our taking it increase every hour." Burgoyne adds that he was much elated by the success at the Alma, and its immediate results, and is grievously disappointed at this bad prospect after it. The object is to ruin the defences as much as possible, and then he sees nothing for it but a desperate assault.

On the 17th of October the batteries opened. The explosion of a magazine paralysed the French fire, and postponed the contemplated attack. Burgoyne regards the naval attack as "a little interlude," and rejoices that no very serious injury happened to the men-of-war. He was much disgusted amid these anxieties to receive newspapers from England, "complacently deciding that Sebastopol is taken." There will be, he says, no flinching, but the task is desperate, and "in case of failure our greatest enemies, I have no doubt, will be in London." All the English engineers considered that the place would have been assaulted on the 17th of October if the French fire had not been silenced. The fire of the Russian works in front of the English batteries was completely reduced. Four days later Burgoyne writes, "I am ready to try a storm, having good trust in our troops." Indeed the army which had fought at the Alma, and which was soon to fight at Inkermann, as long as there was any of it left, was capable of great things. Much of the glory of this army belonged to the men themselves, and much to their officers. They not only gained battles, but, as Burgoyne says, they took "excessive liberties" in the trenches, having as much to do as the French with less than half the force. He thought the French were over-cautious, and too much bound by system for pressing circumstances. "It is before them that the work is to do. We cannot urge them to do what they may deem rash." A letter of Sir George Cathcart of the 2nd November conveys to Burgoyne his idea of how to assault the Redan. "Thus," he says, "some of us will get in, and if well backed up will stay there." He anticipated the honour of giving the *coup de grâce* with his division; but three days later the battle of Inkermann was fought, and Sir George Cathcart was killed. Burgoyne calls this battle "a very heavy affair." The advantages of the success were not so great or striking as if the Allies could have advanced upon the Russians and driven them forcibly from their base of attack. "This we could not do, and the French did not seem to think it prudent." The history of this campaign brings forcibly to the mind the saying that the English infantry is the best in the world, but there is very little of it. With another ten thousand soldiers of the same quality Sebastopol would have been taken, and the sufferings of the winter would have been avoided. The loss at Inkermann was nearly one half of the force engaged. "This is a test at least of the exertions of the army; the leaders will, I presume, be the victims."

But Burgoyne did not forget that this slender force had triumphed. Almost from the day of the victory he urged that it should be improved. He was invariably opposed to submitting to be bullied by the field army of the Russians, who, as he reasonably contended, must be worse off than the Allies. On November 10 he writes, "We are hanging back in too defensive a line of conduct," and he wants to mix up offensive measures with defence. Two days later he writes "that he is anxiously urging the propriety of forward movements, and endeavouring to show that they are the safest." He thinks that many liberties may be taken with an enemy when he is under the depression of a defeat; but at all events it is not a time for submitting to delays and inconveniences by using extreme caution. He considers that many advantages have been lost by over-caution and not pressing harder on the enemy. Much of this has been owing to the want of one sentiment in the management of a combined force. The Allies might have been a shade more enterprising, but he has never desired any assault on the place which would have been an act of desperation. He complains of the "moral timidity" of some officers in the ordinary proceedings of a campaign, and contrasts it with their heroic courage when absolutely in action. "The Russians, by sheer show and bullying, confine us," he says, "to inconvenient limits. Our people do not understand where their strength lies, and to what extent we can enforce what we desire." In consequence of remarks in this strain by Burgoyne, a commanding officer was induced to turn away a set of Russian *tirailleurs* who had lodged themselves within two or three hundred yards of his advanced trench, and had been very troublesome. This was done in a very handsome and creditable way, and would tend, he hoped, to check the bullying impudence of the enemy. Throughout the winter he held the same encouraging language, and never ceased to urge that the Allies had come into the Crimea to besiege Sebastopol, and not to be themselves besieged. Our people, he says, and the French also, conjure up bugbears and report impossibilities that the enemy are doing against us. "It is astonishing how little they all calculate what the enemy can attempt, and what, if we know our relative strength and circumstances, they dare not think of." This mistake was being made

* *Life and Correspondence of Field Marshal Sir John Burgoyne, Bart.* By his Son-in-Law, Lieut.-Col. the Hon. George Wrottesley, Royal Engineers. 2 vols. Vol. II. London: Bentley & Son. 1873.

in the elaborate works on the right to prepare against a similar attack to that of the 5th November, without adverting to the infinitely superior position which the army now held. Again, he writes, "We hang back with all sorts of defensive measures, when time and circumstances require that we should push on." A combined army is not worth three-quarters of the force under absolute command. "Three-quarters of our united force, all British, could do wonders, while our little addition is to the French of far greater value than their numerical strength, for the same number of French could not do half what we do." He thinks that people at home will fear that the army is in danger of being overwhelmed; "we are, however, not so bad as that yet; nor, I confidently trust, ever will be." It will appear presently that when the British public and Parliament became seriously alarmed, and appointed some new Ministers to carry on the war with vigour, their first act was to recall Burgoyne. Yet to him, more perhaps than to any other man, it was due that the army held its ground during the winter. His large experience of war enabled him to put the true value upon circumstances which caused alarm to those who imperfectly understood them. "I find," he says, "a few congenial spirits who encourage the lodgments in advance that I and the engineers desire." To use a favourite phrase of Napier's, he knew war well. Without assuming that he was always right in the advice he gave, it is manifest that he looked upon the position in the only way that was likely to bring the army honourably out of it. The time for caution was before the army embarked for the Crimea, but after landing there the boldest course short of rashness was the best.

It was indeed hardly possible to expect too much from the army which fought at Inkermann, but that army became terribly reduced. On the 23rd December, when the excitement in England was at its height, and the *Times* was just making its vehement demand for "Head," we find Burgoyne quietly proposing a plan for attacking the Russians in the field. The favourite phrase of Marshal St. Arnaud, "un mouvement en avant," would have been eminently applicable to this plan, which, however, from want of transport and inefficiency of artillery horses, could not be at that time attempted. But not the less do we admire the spirit of the plan. "It would be taking the initiative, and showing a spirit of enterprise, which always creates a useful moral effect. It would be giving the law instead of receiving it, as we have been now for too long a time compelled to do." It was for those who were in mass near their resources to take the offensive against those who might be far from theirs. The weather and the condition of the country must affect the enemy in the field much more than the Allies. This was a precious time for the Allies to seek some opportunity of profiting by their advantage. When the frosts should set in, the Russians would be able to receive reinforcements and supplies; but without allowing time for them to do so, Burgoyne would advance and drive them to a distance from Sebastopol, and compel them to leave the fortress to its fate. This programme looks infinitely more attractive as well as more promising than the endless work of trenches and batteries which the French generals preferred. At the same time Burgoyne urged incessantly that the true point of attack of the fortress was the Malakoff Tower. The controversy between him and the French engineers on this point was only terminated by the arrival of General Niel, who, being sent by the French Emperor to examine the state and prospects of the siege, declared in favour of Burgoyne's view. The attack on the Malakoff Tower was then commenced and vigorously prosecuted, and finally succeeded, with the decisive effect which Burgoyne had anticipated. Burgoyne wishes that he had the old Light Division of the Peninsula to do the outpost duty—"The Russians would be handsomely punished for excursions they sometimes make." But as regards fighting he does full justice to the Crimean army. Our allies, he says, have frankly acknowledged, with respect to specific feats, that their men could not have done them. "Our cool, steady advance, in contradistinction to their own rapid, impatent way of making an attack, is what they cannot understand." But the French in midwinter were singing and gay, whereas for months Burgoyne had not witnessed so much as a smile on the face of a British soldier, who, although suffering and serious, makes no complaint. Burgoyne deprecated the foreign enlistment, as likely to lower the reputation of the army of which he thus wrote. If we had had foreigners at Inkermann, he says, we should never have gained the credit we did there. "They will never rise to our scale, but we may drop to theirs."

The British nation became aware during the last years of Burgoyne's life that he had been very ill treated by their rulers during the Crimean war. His recall by Lord Panmure was not only unreasonable, but almost absurd. We could not compete with our allies in number of soldiers, but they felt the superiority of our officers alike in technical skill and in moral force. Burgoyne has described the French officers whom he accompanied in seeking a landing-place on the Crimean coast as "thinking very badly of the whole concern, and proposing one wild or temporizing scheme after another, which we had to refute." Lord Raglan, Sir George Brown, and Sir John Burgoyne were all veterans of the Spanish war, and they were able, in spite of their disapproval of the invasion, to propose and carry a plan of operations which made success possible. Lord Hardinge, after reading certain papers upon this war, remarked that "the comments of Sir John Burgoyne had more vigorous good sense in them than the vaunted science of our French allies." Sir Harry Jones, who became head of the British Engineers after Burgoyne's departure,

wrote to him on September 15, 1855, that "Sebastopol was taken by the point he always indicated, the Malakoff." He goes on to say that the British attack on the Great Redan succeeded; but, after having established ourselves in force, the men could not be got to advance, and subsequently fell back, after losing about two thousand killed and wounded—a very large proportion of officers. It is remarkable that Burgoyne's disinclination to assault the Redan was justified by the failure of two attempts upon it after he returned home. It may be suspected that if Burgoyne had been present he would have employed a larger force in these attempts. He would not have forgotten his own experience of the value of "heavy columns" at Badajoz and St. Sebastian. It is remarkable that Sir George Brown, writing from his retirement to Sir John Burgoyne on the second failure at the Redan, says that "he shall always regret that Simpson did not slip another division at the work and capture it at any price." This was the spirit in which such a campaign should have been carried on, and we cannot say that the successors of Burgoyne and Brown improved either upon their intellectual or moral fitness for the task of capturing Sebastopol.

EASTLAKE'S HINTS ON HOUSEHOLD TASTE.

BY some accident or other the first edition of this most useful and opportune book escaped our notice. We are very glad to make acquaintance with it now in its enlarged and revised form. Its great value seems to us to consist in its simplicity and persuasiveness. Mr. Eastlake expresses what are the general, not to say universal, convictions among all who have paid much attention to questions of practical art. There is no novelty in his remarks or criticisms. They are neither original nor very brilliant. But they are well timed, and very suggestive and instructive. He has, moreover, a broad artistic sympathy and plenty of good humour. Many readers who would be repelled by an array of stiff principles and a code of austere canons of taste will be carried along, almost without perceiving it, by Mr. Eastlake's unpretending and familiar disquisitions. It is much the same with aesthetical as with theological propagandism. He makes the most converts who is learning himself while he teaches others, and who makes his disciples feel that every fresh step is, as it were, a new discovery made by them and by himself in common. In this pleasant and informal way Mr. Eastlake goes in detail through most of the minor branches of decorative art, pointing out what seems to him to be wrong and bad, and suggesting what in each case would be more in accordance with truthful and natural principles of design.

A handsome book, well printed and with attractive illustrations, and such that, open it where you will, you light upon some interesting discussion on common matters of taste that affect every one who lives in a house or who uses furniture, is sure to command a large audience. It is purposely meant for the "general public." Those who know anything of art would scarcely be satisfied with the slight and informal manner in which the subject is treated. They would require something more systematic, and in particular would wish for pictorial representations of all the forms and ornaments condemned or commended. It is not easy to express shapes by words only. We confess that we ourselves desiderate many more woodcuts. Nothing is so effective in art-teaching as the appeal to the eye. Indeed it is the eye alone which can judge ultimately of those forms of art with which this volume is concerned. We doubt whether any single book ever did so much to reform public taste and opinion in the matter of architectural style and the decencies of church arrangement as Pugin's famous *Contrasts*. On one side that exquisite draughtsman gave us a Gothic interior in complete ideal "restoration"; on the other, you saw what that vision of beauty had become by centuries of neglect and ignorance, or of wilfully injurious treatment. Why did not Mr. Eastlake "contrast" in this way all the details of modern furniture? He would have converted hundreds by his pictures, while his letterpress will not persuade more than tens. As it is, the illustrations of the volume before us are arbitrarily chosen and of very unequal merit. Sometimes, we fear, undue prominence has been given to the modern designs of such artists or manufacturers as may have offered woodcuts to the work. For some of these, we fancy, are already familiar to us. At other times we confess that, on looking at the cuts, we are not always sure whether we are meant to approve of them or to execrate them. Occasionally we are even inclined to think that the author's own designs, though they avoid many faults of design, have new defects of their own. But, after all, as we have said, this inequality of the book is perhaps one of its most useful features.

Mr. Eastlake, by his own personal predilections, would seem to be a strict mediævalist. His own designs at least are always of the strictest sect of the school. We observe, however, that in his preface he disclaims any exclusive allegiance to the Gothic style, and only argues for the true spirit and sound principles of ancient design. Here he is quite right. In household furniture especially the types of design may allowably vary according to individual taste, so long as the construction is honest and good and appropriate, and the details are fitting and truthful. The eminent French architect and *littérateur* M. Viollet Le Duc has expressed

* *Hints on Household Taste in Furniture, Upholstery, and other Details.* By Charles L. Eastlake, F.R.I.B.A. Third Edition, revised. London: Longmans & Co. 1872.

the true law that ought to regulate design in those branches of art so admirably in the sentence chosen by Mr. Eastlake for his motto that we venture to transcribe it :—

Parmi ces splendeurs à bon marché, ce faux goût et ce faux luxe, nous sommes ravis quand nous trouvons un banc bien fait, une bonne table de chêne portant d'aplomb sur ses pieds, des rideaux de laine qui paraissent être en laine, une chaise commode et solide, une armoire qui s'ouvre et se ferme bien, nous montrant en dedans et en dehors le bois dont elle est faite, et l'aisance avec laquelle on devine son usage. Espérons un retour vers ces idées saines, et qu'en fait de mobilier, comme en toute chose, on en viendra à comprendre que le goût consiste à paraître ce que l'on est, et non ce que l'on voudrait être.

Incongruity and falsity of design, dull mechanical uniformity of detail, in which every individual touch of the living artist is destroyed, and general degeneracy of manufacture, are the patent faults of almost all the common furniture and implements which we are obliged to use in daily life. Is there any remedy? We are not so hopeful on this point as we once were. At any rate, the only possible remedy consists in the wider spread of true artistic feeling and culture. It is easier to supply at a low price a vulgar article, multiplied *ad infinitum* by machinery, than to produce on moderate terms objects of art-workmanship in each of which skilled design and the skilled labour of the individual artificer are to be combined. And therefore our manufacturers, with a few honourable exceptions, compete with one another in mere cheapness of production of the meanest types of form and ornament. When our art teachers have created a demand for better workmanship, we do not doubt that it will be supplied. Meanwhile there has been no serious attempt, except in ceramic manufacture, to produce articles of good design and execution at such low prices as shall compete with the base patterns which have present possession of the markets. Mr. Eastlake gives many most telling instances of the prohibitive cost of any improvement whatever upon the common types. He tells one story in which an upholsterer asked considerably less for a chair overburdened with a quantity of expensive ornamentation than for the same design before any ornament at all was added. Undoubtedly the vicious principle which deliberately tries to promote trade, as it is called, by producing articles which are not strong enough to last and must soon be replaced, has much to do with many of the absurd changes of fashion in matters of household furniture and decoration. We believe that in this matter our tradesmen and artisans would find that the old proverb is true, and that honesty is the best policy in the long run.

We now propose to give some idea of Mr. Eastlake's method of treating his subject. After a few introductory remarks, he proceeds to discuss in a general way our street architecture; and then, going indoors, he examines in detail the several rooms of an average modern house, with their fittings and furniture. He ends with supplemental chapters on Crockery, Table Glass, Dress, Jewelry, Plate, and Cutlery. The entrance-hall first invites notice. Our author here inveighs with almost needless warmth against *graining*. Surely graining is in its way a nearly harmless sham; for it makes no pretence to be oak. Its practical advantage, in a London house, is its cleanliness and brightness, and its fitness for varnishing. Preserve us from the muddy stains—chocolate or umber—with which so many of our mediæval architects defile the deal which they use for cheapness sake! After all, what is wanted in a smoky town is light and cleanliness; and this is not given, so far as our experience goes, by the flattened colours affected by the extreme mediævalists. Common sense is, as we have always argued, at the bottom of really good taste. We observe that Mr. Eastlake pleads for the retention of the knocker on the hall-door of a London house. There is a school which advocates its supersession by the bell, as carrying the sound away from the living-rooms to the offices where the servants live whose duty it is to open the door, and who say, let knockers be reserved for fashionable doors behind which a hall-porter lurks in readiness to open them at a moment's notice. On the other hand, the knocker has a practical advantage over the mechanical, monotonous bell which appeals to the master and the mistress of the smallest no less than of the largest household. One great object of the pre-monic noise is to afford the *visiteur* full opportunity to be in or out of the way as he judges most convenient, and, in concert with an experienced ear, the knocker seldom fails in this duty. But the bell is totally deficient in tact, and gives the same stereotyped tinkle to the dun, the bore, the tax-gatherer, and the friend of one's bosom. Among the few articles of modern furniture which have preserved traditionally a good method of design and construction, Mr. Eastlake singles out the bucket, the bedroom towel-horse, and the common "Windsor" chair. Here we quite agree with him. We do not remember that he points out, in his remarks on chairs, the extreme folly of abandoning cross-pieces and stays to strengthen the legs. Nothing can be more absurd than a chair with its four legs unconnected by any tie or bond. The leverage on each leg is excessive; and the chair must break sooner or later unless it is unnecessarily unwieldy. No one can deny the picturesqueness or the sound construction of the old carved high-backed chairs and sofas such as Mr. Eastlake figures from Cothele and Knole. But can we seriously advise us to revive them? We are luxurious enough to think that a modern easy-chair is really an improvement on the furniture of our forefathers. One has only to go into Filmer's, or Howard's, and see the rows of easy-chairs of fifty or sixty different patterns, and try to choose the one which shall best suit oneself, to find out how much one person's idea of comfort differs from another's, and how much may be done, and has been

done, to provide comfort and ease. It would seem to be a safe conclusion that in the good old times all were uncomfortable alike. Surely, too, the stiff old high-backed sofas of the seventeenth century are equally unsuitable for reproduction. Is there any more pathetic sight than to see the very aged poor, or perhaps some consumptive patient, living, and at last dying, in chairs in which they cannot even recline? Why, there are few London parishes, we suppose, in which easy-chairs are not kept to be lent out to the sick. We argue then that the easy-chair is a true comfort; and it is preposterous to wish to bring back an article of furniture like a Jacobean chair, that has been fairly improved off the face of our homes. Mr. Eastlake ought rather to have shown us how to lend to our modern chairs and sofas better and more artistic forms. Agreeing with our author as we do in most of his criticisms, we naturally select for notice points in which we differ from him. Among these is the telescope dining-table. We confess we think this modern invention a most ingenious and useful device, only second to the expanding circular table. Provided that it is well made, it really provides us with a firm solid table, of which we can, with very little trouble, vary the size according to the numbers who are to be seated at it. Now, not to speak of the smallness of London rooms, is it not desirable to be able to dine four, or six, or eight persons, as it may be, all within reach and hearing of each other? Mr. Eastlake positively recommends us to bring back the long Jacobean tables such as remain in college halls and in some old farmhouses. In the first place, an average-sized dining-room would be always blocked up with such a table; and, in the next, a party, unless the whole table were occupied, would always seem scattered and incomplete. Next we must dissent from Mr. Eastlake's own design for a library book-case. There seem to us three conspicuous faults in it; cupboards with clumsy doors which leave useless and objectionable corners behind them; shelves of the same depth for quartos, octavos, and duodecimos; and, worst of all, a prodigious waste of space in the cornice with a meaningless, unapproachable cupboard in the pedimented roof. Once more we object to chimney-pieces so high that it is difficult to reach them; and we contend that mirrors are a beautiful and fitting ornament of living-rooms; and we protest against bed-hangings under any form whatever. But these after all are very unimportant matters. If they provoke discussion and suggest thought, a great deal has been gained. When people begin to argue on matters of taste, it will go hard but that sound principles will win their way with the more intelligent.

We heartily commend then Mr. Eastlake's genial and suggestive book to those who are about to marry or to furnish. They need not agree with all he says; but they will learn from him many a true and useful lesson. And the mere cultivation of their taste in the homely matters of household furniture and ornamentation will be the source of much pure and healthy enjoyment.

RECENT EDITIONS OF THE ODYSSEY.*

IN explanation of the fragmentary appearance of his commentary on the narrative of Odysseus, Professor Mayor informs us that "many schools are this year employed upon the Ninth Book of the Odyssey"; and this is tantamount to an assurance that a goodly number of young heads are in a fair way to make acquaintance with what is in fact the fertile prototype of all fairy tales. *Felices ter, et amplius!* are those who enter for the first time this land of adventure and marvel—who enter it too with abundance of light for their path, and not, as, in their fathers' school days, with the bare farthing rushlight of a text and a lexicon. Those were the days when our Orbilius thought that bricks should be made without straw, as far as interpretation and illustration of Greek authors was concerned; and the results are patent in a number of hard-headed elderly gentlemen with whom it is an article of faith that there is not, and never was, any sense in a Greek Chorus. But all this is changed by such guides and lively companions as those whose helps to the interpretation of the Odyssey we purpose to notice in the present article. Each in its measure elucidates the text, and disengages the language of Homer of all possible perplexities; all are more or less helpful in making the study of the adventures of Odysseus a pleasure instead of a task. Mr. Merry's work indeed confines itself more rigidly than the others to the explanation of Homer's text, and, following for the most part the commentaries of Nitzsch and Crusius, is often serviceable in the unriddling of a stiff passage by neat "construes" and clear statements of the syntax. Professor Mayor is conspicuous here, as in his Juvenal, for the masses of annotative lore which he piles up in illustration of any given Homeric topic or custom. Dr. Hayman aims at the most comprehensive undertaking of the three, and into his wider limits throws abundant matter to bear upon the critical and explanatory study of the Odyssey, and to illustrate the old-world bard from stores of modern literature, at the same time that he keeps in view throughout his commentary the vexed question of authorship. On this subject we have already had something to say. At present it will be our pur-

* *The Odyssey of Homer.* Edited, with Marginal References, various Readings, Notes, and Appendices, by Henry Hayman, D.D. Vol. II. Books VII.—XII. London: Nutt. 1873.

The *Narrative of Odysseus.* Od. IX.—XII. With a Commentary. By John E. B. Mayor, M.A., Fellow of St. John's, Cambridge. London: Macmillan & Co. 1873.

Homer. *Odyssey.* Books I.—XII. By W. W. Merry, Fellow and Lecturer of Lincoln College, Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1870.

pose rather to consider the merits of the commentary itself, and this by comparison with those of two able compilers.

The common ground trodden by all three editors is not indeed large, for Mr. Mayor begins with the Ninth Book and breaks off in his commentary at the 266th line of the Tenth. But even within that space there is field for comparison and contrast; and though we have an affection for Mr. Mayor's occasional piles of welcome lore, we are bound to say that it is Dr. Hayman who at every turn supplies us with parallels from subsequent fable and fairytale. Thus in the Ninth Book (274-80) he suggests the comparison of Sindbad's encounter with the black cannibal giant, and his mode of dealing with him, with the story of Odysseus and the Cyclops. In the Tenth he points out—what is beyond Mr. Mayor's limit—the manifest obligation of Milton to Homer's episode about Circe, not only for the plot, but for the incidents and details, of his *Comus*. Where Hermes meets our hero, as he goes over rock and through thicket towards Circe's palace, his address beginning—

πῆ δ' αὐτ., ω δύστην, δι' ἀκριας ἐρχεται οἰος (281)

finds an echo in the speech of the attendant spirit, "Alas, good venturesome youth," &c., in *Comus*; and our scholar poet made allegoric use of the Homeric "moly" for the small unsightly root which is the counterspell in the same masque. No one can exaggerate the value of such parallels, especially in these days when inducement is needed to entice the mass of young readers into the delightful but neglected paths of their own classical poetry. We must, however, not forget that oftentimes Mr. Mayor also reflects this sort of light upon the poet he is annotating; and the upholders of Homer's antiquity have to thank him for a casual extract from Thirlwall's "Greece," designed to illustrate the expression ηλιος περινιστρο βουλιτρώνε, which traces up to a primitive and simple age the description of times of the day by the civil occupations belonging to them. When names came to be given, they would supersede such archaic descriptions. Anent the Lotophagi, and the flowery food which was their diet, he contributes very curious information on ix. 93, and cites Polybius, Pliny, Theophrastus, and Shaw's "Travels" in reference to the leaves, flower, fruit, and taste of the lotus. It is shown by Dr. Hayman that ancient commentators were divided between its identity with the medlar fruit and its likeness to the lotus or Lily of the Nile, whilst the testimony of Herodotus points to a fruit like that of the mastic tree. The authorities referred to by Dr. Hayman tend to fix the African coast near the Syrtes as the country of these lotus-eaters. At ix. 209 both Mr. Mayor and Dr. Hayman contribute a fund of information respecting the proportions of water to wine in the cups of the heroes. The Iamarian wine was celebrated and potent; and Dr. Hayman suggests that the poet must have meant to exaggerate its strength by making it affect the Cyclops as it did, after it had been so drowned in water. The water appears to have been customarily poured in first, and, however the passage is translated, it was one part wine to twenty parts water. Dr. Hayman says, and his references bear out his statement, that αὐτ. in the passage in question implies "proportion," not mere affusion. "He would pour one cupful of wine to twenty measures of water." Mr. Mayor, on the other hand, denies that αὐτ. is distributive, and translates it by our preposition "on." Mr. Merry supports the former and more probable view. Here and there the Doctor and the Professor, approaching a passage from a different point of view, club their information in a very pleasant picnic fashion: as where, on the name which Odysseus gives himself to the Cyclops, οὐρικ ιουγ' ὄνου, and the Cyclops' promise to eat Oulius last, by way of a guest-gift, Dr. Hayman recalls the burlesque or parody in the *Wasps* of Aristophanes, where Philocleon borrows a leaf or two from the book of Odysseus. But Mr. Mayor is more reconcilable when he quotes the later Greek proverb of "the Gift of the Cyclops" to imply "a graceless boon." It is preserved by Lucian and Plutarch; and Gregory Nazianzen says that "Julian had done him and Basil 'a Cyclopean honour' in reserving them as the last victims of persecution." Another of these erudite and pleasant notes of Mr. Mayor is on the bag containing the adverse winds (αὐτὸν βοὸς, x. 14) presented by Aeolus to Odysseus. After ransacking antiquity for notices of wind-bags and wind-layers, he comes to the Norwegian witches who unloose at will the storms out of their sack-prison, the South-African rain-makers, and the witches of Lapland, who sell knotted strings, of which the first untying produces a moderate breeze, the second a gale, the third a tempest.

The difference between Dr. Hayman and Mr. Mayor as purveyors of this kind of collateral information is that with the former it is reserved chiefly for the purpose of making his author consistent with himself or with his assumed date and age. On the 110th line of Book IX., where the spontaneous crops of the Cyclops are said to include τυροι και κριθαι, he shows that this need not be a poetical embellishment, and from the development of something very like our oat from the *avena fatua* by cultivation he argues for a wild wheat and barley existing in Homer's day. "Ten distinct cereals (five wheats and two barleys among them) were cultivated in the Stone period by the inmates of the pile-houses in the Swiss lakes; and oats are said to have come under culture later in the Bronze period." The pertinence of this observation is not diminished by the fact that the annotator is indebted for it to Mr. Darwin on "Variation of Animals." Again in ix. 345 the drinking cup wherein Odysseus presents the potent wine to the Cyclops is called κυνίβιον, and a suspicion of comparative modernness might attach to

a word which in Theocritus (i. 27) means, as its apparent derivation would independently lead us to conclude, "a cup with ivy carved on it." The scholiasts give both senses—the cup of ivy wood and the cup with ivy wrought on it; but Dr. Hayman, holding as post-Homeric the connexion of ivy with Dionysus, which gave currency to each, seeks the root of the word in some form of κινέων or κινών, a *receptacle* generally. "From this by metathesis (κινέων, κινών) the word probably comes, in the sense of a rustic cup." The statement of Cato, *de Re Rustica*, "that an ivy wood vessel would not contain wine," makes for the argument that κινέιν, as a wine-cup, has no connexion with κινός.

In other places Dr. Hayman's research throws curious light on phrases and expressions, and subserves incidentally his vindictory purpose. In reference to the people spoken of in the speech of Teiresias to Odysseus, "who do not know of a sea, nor mix salt with their food" (xi. 123)—expressions intended to denote outer barbarism—he gathers that in Homer's day the sea was the source of that condiment, and presses Varro and Sallust into his service to confirm this note of the poem's antiquity by evidence that rock-salt is an advance in civilization upon sea-salt. Upon the words ιταί οἰνοκαρποι, "the fruitless willows withering fast," which in x. 510 are given by Circe as an index to the Grove of Persephone, he accumulates various authority for the incompetence of this tree to ripen its seed and fruit. In a note to his learned and exhaustive appendix on the *teuthia*—which may be regarded as a well-considered examination of the soundness of that book as a whole and as to its parts—he cites from Stobaeus a passage of Porphyry to the effect that the willow sheds its fruit before maturity, and that mixed in wine this fruit produces barrenness. The commentator surmises that some such tradition may lurk under the "wearing the willow" and the "sing willow, willow, willow," of forsaken damsels.

In the Tenth Book (vv. 82-4) occurs a somewhat difficult passage, more fully explained by Mr. Mayor and Mr. Merry than by Dr. Hayman. It relates to Odysseus's account of his reaching Laestrygonia, where, as he shows, the courses of night and day well nigh touch. The poet's way of expressing this is as follows:—

οθι ποιμέν ποιμήν
ιηπει εισελάνων, ο δι' ιειδάνων ιπακούει.
ιειθα ε' δηπνος άνηρ διωντις ιειράτο μισθούει,
τὸν μιν βουκολίνων, τὸν δ' άργυρα μῆλα τομείνων.

Mr. Mayor translates, "Where the shepherd as he drives in his flock calls to the oxherd, and he, as he drives out, replies; there a sleepless man would have earned double wages, the one by tending oxen, the other by pasturing sheep"; and he explains the passage of the drivers coming within earshot of one another in the short nights, as the sheep are driven home late and the oxen afield early. "This," says Mr. Mayor, "suggests to Homer the merry thought that, if the shepherd could do without sleep, he might at once take charge of the herd of oxen." "Day dawned," explains Mr. Merry, "almost the instant that night fell. The twenty-four hours of day and night are roughly divided into two halves of twelve hours' daylight. A man who could do without sleep could spend half this time in feeding sheep, and the other half in minding cattle, and so get double wages for double work. He would drive home the first batch at nightfall, and be ready to take out the second batch directly daylight reappeared, which happened so immediately that the outward-bound and homeward-bound herdsmen actually passed one another in the gateway." It is added by both annotators that the poet is only contemplating the nearness of dawn to night. Though Dr. Hayman does not go so fully into all this, yet his note upon the passage is fraught with equal interest, for he adduces in illustration of it Hesiod's account (*Theog.* 748, &c.) of the coincidence of the going forth and coming in of night and day, and points out the resemblances and the discrepancies of either passage. In a number of minor points of interpretation we have come upon a difference between the annotators we have been examining, and in most instances we find ourselves constrained to adopt Dr. Hayman's view. He passes over indeed the words στηράπενοι δ' ιμάχοντο μάχην (ix. 54), where Mr. Merry wrongly joins στηράπενοι with μάχην, whilst Mr. Mayor, more correctly, takes ιμάχοντο μάχην as an instance of the cognate accusative στηράπενοι being, i.e., "aīcē instructā"; but, in ix. 214, δισσωρ θυμός άγνωρ ανδρος ιπαλεποτοι—μύρον, he disagrees with Mr. Mayor's notion that ανδρος is the subject, and takes it for the object—*i.e.*, "that it would overcome the wild man." At 239 of the same book it is simpler with him to let alone the reading βαθεις ιειθειν αιλῆς, and to take αιλῆς of the cavern itself, than with Mr. Mayor and Mr. Merry to adopt Rumpf's conjecture, ιειθειν. All three render differently the words χειρ' ιπμασάμενος (ix. 302). Dr. Hayman's interpretation, "Feeling for it with the hand," is the interpretation which approves itself to our acceptance; and in ix. 398, where the Cyclops flings from him the stake (*ιρρούει* άρο ιο χειριν άλνων), we cannot doubt that χειριν belongs to ιρρούει, and that Mr. Mayor is mistaken in joining it with άλνων ("raging with his hands"). There is probability in Dr. Hayman's connexion of διάνων (a word expressing mental aberration) with "hallucinor." In 540 of the same book—

καδ δ' ιβαλεν μετόπισθε νος κνανοπρέφειο
τυρθόν, ιεινόντεν δ—

all three concur in the comma after τυρθόν. Dr. Hayman alone gives the *coup de grâce* to the reading τυρθόν ιεινόντεν δ—"and failed by a little"—with a convincing reason. "To join it with

ιδύνεσθεν would be a violence to the particle *δι*, which is later than second in a Homeric sentence only when a preposition and its case, or an article and noun, precedes."

In x. 32 we are persuaded that the sense requires Dr. Hayman's interpretation of *ποδα νην* as equivalent to *πηλάλων* in the sailor's vernacular, though the other annotators adhere to the commoner but less apt sense of the "foot-ropes." In v. 548 of the same book he derives *ἀντεῖρι*, in spite of Buttman, from *ἀντος*, and happily translates it "Indulge in fleecy sleep," or "sleep as soft as wool." One more instance, and we have done with comparisons. In the Eleventh Book, v. 366, Alcinous is represented as distinguishing Odysseus from the class of pro-miscuous impostors:—

φειδία τ' ἀπρόνοτας θετιν κι τις οὐδὲν ἴδοιτο.

This line Mr. Merry interprets, "fashioning falsehoods out of things which one can never see with one's eyes." *θετιν* here would be equivalent to *ιετούρων*, *δι*. But much better than this, or than the same annotator's other alternative, is Dr. Hayman's resort to an ellipse of *ιετούρων* with *ἀπρόνοτας* before *θετιν*—i.e., "trumping up falsehoods no one can even tell from what source." In truth, the greater number of his interpretations are recommended by simplicity and likelihood; guiding points which influence his acceptance or rejection of such plausible various readings as *ιετούρων*, which, according to Eustathius, precisians proposed to read for *ιεταρεν* in ix. 320, because brute force was more natural than the use of edge-tools to a monster like the Cyclops. This emendation loses its plausibility when, in the same book, art and constructive skill are expressly predicated of the implements and utensils of the Cyclops' dairy. It is, we think, rightly suspected by Dr. Hayman of being "a scholar's afterthought."

Of these three helps to the pleasant reading of the *Odyssey*—“the most delightful,” as Mr. Merry puts it, “of all Greek books”—we rate highest Dr. Hayman's work, as being the most thorough, exhaustive, and available for every need. When complete, his *Odyssey* will be an English edition of a classic calculated to command respect. The two lesser works with which we have compared it do not profess so high an aim, perhaps; still they exhibit scholarship and ability in their particular ways. But Dr. Hayman's is a work which no scholar should omit to add to his library. The proofs of erudition which it exhibits in the preface, notes, and appendices ought to represent henceforth to candid and qualified minds the very highest and most convincing form of testimonial.

THE BURGOMASTER'S FAMILY.*

THIS book is in one sense a novelty. Seldom does a Dutch work of fiction put on an English dress and present itself for our criticism, and the public is by no means familiar with the tales which find acceptance in Holland. From time to time, indeed, a translation does make its appearance, and some years ago a collection of sketches, some serious and some humorous, which depicted the life of a pastor in the Netherlands, and was called the *Manse of Mastland*, was received with a certain degree of favour, principally on account of the unfamiliar nature of the scenes and the life described. That book was, however, rather an autobiography than a novel; the author, though writing anonymously, described the place in which he himself ministered and the occurrences in which he bore a part; moreover, he treated more of Church affairs than of the proceedings of ordinary life, and looked at things very much from one point of view. On meeting with the *Burgomaster's Family*, therefore, we naturally sat down to it with pleasurable anticipations, hoping for once to get rid of conventionalities and stereotyped characters, and to find some racy descriptions of Dutch life which, though they might perhaps now and then savour of coarseness, would nevertheless form a pleasing variety in the dreary round of novel-reading to which the critic is condemned.

Great then was our disappointment on finding a story singularly devoid of local colouring. If, instead of Burgomaster Welters, the master of the house had been called Alderman Tomkinson; had but one letter been appended to the cognomen of Lieutenant Smit; and had the names of other personages and places been slightly changed; the tale might have perfectly passed for an English one. It really contains scarcely an incident which might not have occurred in any of our country towns in middle-class society; so that it is difficult to understand what the translator means when he talks of “the faithful delineation of Dutch character and Dutch family life, which can only be clearly discerned by Dutch critics.” Sir John Shaw Lefevre has, however, in his neat little introduction to Madame Van Walré's story, provided us with a critic's compendium, pointing out all the subjects in it which he thinks worthy of admiration, so that if after reading it we should chance to go astray our error will be unpardonable. Nevertheless we prefer to find out for ourselves the merits and defects of any work; and we may venture to assert that high praise at the outset is injudicious on the part of an editor, and more likely to be prejudicial than favourable to his bantling. We cannot on this occasion complain, as we have often before found it needful to do, of being left in the dark as to the prefix which should accompany the name of the authoress; for we are favoured with an account of the birth, parentage, and education of the writer; nay, the fact

of her having had five brothers, of whom three died in infancy and one subsequently, is duly chronicled, although it is not easy to see what these pieces of information have to do with the lady's capability for producing a good novel. “Christine Müller”—for under this *nom de plume* the *Burgomaster's Family* was brought out—is not wanting in a sense of humour, as she shows in her portrait of Mr. Welters, whose rule of life it was “to let God's water flow over God's field,” and who had one idol on whose altar he would, in case of necessity, have sacrificed everything belonging to him. But the notion that every country symbolized itself to the good Burgomaster by the special delicacies which it could furnish for the table, and that the idea of the birth of a child came before his mind in the form of a christening dinner, and a marriage in the form of a *déjeuner*, is by no means new. Indeed the *Burgomaster's Family* is not in any respect new, either as to the plot, of which there is very little, or the types of character represented; but these latter have the merit of being well sustained and naturally described. There is also a quaintness in the mode of writing, quite distinct from affectation, which the translator has done well to preserve, while yet he has put the story into very readable English.

It would not be correct to say of this book, as one can do in a few rare cases, that it does not read like a translation, but we may acknowledge at least that it reads like a good translation. There are three principal female characters in the tale, and of these Emmy, the Burgomaster's daughter, is the chief; although we can hardly call her a heroine, for she not only does nothing heroic, but she is a girl whose quiet existence has hardly any events in it of marked interest except the affliction which befalls her lover, and who does not possess the one virtue which might have been expected from her gentle steady character—namely, constancy. She is told that her lover has married in a foreign land, and, without any proof of the fact being adduced, except that he had been seen coming out of a theatre with a lady on his arm, she believes that he is false, and is content to marry for a home a widower cousin. Heroine No. 2 is certainly not commonplace; she is a young lady who had been born and brought up in Java, but who, with her father, Mr. Arnold, resides in a mysterious manner near Dilburg, and who, having by her beauty withdrawn Otto Welters from his allegiance to his betrothed, Mary Van Stein (another quiet damsel, who, however, has plenty of dignity and force of character), marries him, to their joint misery. Otto, having succeeded in penetrating into Beckley, the jealously secluded residence of the Arnolds, being employed by the master of the mansion in putting forward certain claims to a very large estate to which he believed himself to be the heir, sees Celine Arnold “in a long black silk dress, without a trace of crinoline . . . her beautiful hair in picturesque confusion, half hanging down behind and half fastened up by a little gold dagger with a diamond handle,” and, notwithstanding his engagement to Mary, falls violently in love with her. The young lady is both unconventional and uncompromising; she smokes a cigar after luncheon with her father and his guest; and when she is asked to play something, refuses peremptorily, on the ground that she is not inclined for music; further adding, “And what I have once said that I won't do, I don't do.” Yet neither these evidences of the possession of a strong will, nor the exposition, on a later occasion, by the fair one of her religious creed, or rather want of a creed, have any weight with Otto, although he is represented as being quite a model young man; and he succeeds in persuading Celine to become his wife, though, as is only natural, he is sadly tormented almost immediately after their union by the breaches of Dilburg etiquette which his lovely bride insists upon committing. Celine's passionate love for her dog Caesar, her wild rides upon her white horse Schimmel, and the fury with which she meets the smallest opposition from her husband, are traits of her almost savage nature; she is a graceful, half-tamed tigress, who resents as imprisonment the smallest restraint even from the hand whose caresses she occasionally endures, and who chafes against the decencies of society as so many inflictions specially devised against herself. But this Arnold family can hardly be regarded as a bit of Dutch portraiture; Javanese might have settled anywhere else as well as in Holland, and their modes of proceeding are as unlike those of their steady neighbours as it is possible to conceive. The tragic end of the wilful beauty is scarcely natural, although very touching; and it is a great mistake to give us no means of knowing what was the future of the faithful Caesar after his mistress had left him for ever. The most interesting people in the book are decidedly the Eversberg family; Eversberg himself, however, is too sketchy and slightly drawn, no hint being given of the nature of the phantom which is dimly seen occasionally appearing by his side. His dignified wife, still beautiful, although the mother of a grown-up son, is a loveable character, and so is Bruno, the frank young sailor, so loyal in his devotion to the playfellow of his childhood. The arrest of Eversberg during the ball at his own house is managed with some dramatic power, and Bruno's subsequent behaviour is in keeping with his character; but that Emmy should lose confidence in her lover because his letters had been suppressed, and should so willingly accept cousin Siword, and that without telling him of her engagement when she was so near doing so, appears an improbable arrangement altogether. The revenge of William de Graaff for her refusal of his affections is, on the contrary, just such a piece of mean spite as a low creature of the kind would be likely to perpetrate. The joint household of De Graaff and Welters is a tolerably good picture of a family

* *The Burgomaster's Family; or, Weal and Woe in a Little World.* By Christine Müller. Translated from the Dutch by Sir John Shaw Lefevre, K.C.B., F.R.S. London: Longmans & Co.

which is governed by an unacknowledged head in the person of a vulgar and disagreeable woman, with whose own children she seems to be no greater favourite than with her step-children, who behave to her in an irreproachable manner. The old Burgomaster is a glutton, and nothing more.

Had the author been writing for the English public, she would probably have made great capital of the peculiar features of her country, and have brought out in an especial manner the oddities of her compatriots; but she has not apparently had any such end in view, and probably never expected that her tale would attain to the honour of translation. She has therefore merely dealt with society as she herself saw it; and this is in itself a recommendation, as it is too much the custom with authors in search of entertaining material wherewith to fill their volumes, to attempt to describe social circles of which they can have no personal knowledge—circles either above or below, or otherwise totally removed from, the one of which they themselves form a part. Such attempts necessarily result in failure. If our recommendation were attended to, every novel-writer would place his *dramatis personæ* in circumstances which he himself could thoroughly understand, so that he would be fully competent to show the various influences which mould his characters, and the motives which guide them, without having to introduce what is manifestly forced and unreal. Madame Van Walrée might, however, have made a great deal more of Eversberg; in him she had the means of producing a grand character study; in the hands of George Eliot, for instance, what would he not have become! A man who for twenty-seven years lived prosperous, respected, and wealthy, having for a wife the loveliest woman in Dilburg who, sprung from an old and proud family, had not disdained to marry the rising manufacturer—this man, revered and loved, whose munificence was proverbial, with a son who on reaching man's estate was everything that fond parents could desire—yet all this time having a gnawing grief at his heart, remorse and fear of discovery never ceasing to torment him in the midst of all his successes. How much more artistic than the sudden revelation of his crime would have been the glimpses which might have been given of the unfortunate man's life of concealed misery! A fine opportunity for subtle analysis was here thrown away. Instead of that letter to his son in which Eversberg after his imprisonment reveals to him the fatal secret, and explains not only the causes which led to his crime, but the sufferings which for seven-and-twenty years he has had to endure on account of it, why was not the reader allowed to gain from the study of his character, at all events, a suspicion of the dark fate hanging over him? There is an inconsistency, too, in the character of Joseph Müller, the son of the murdered man, who is represented at first as heartless, base, and dishonourable, so as quite to justify his father in disowning and disinheriting him, whereas on his return to Dilburg to denounce the murder of his father he appears as a kindly, generous man, actuated by no spirit of revenge, and considerate to an unusual degree for the wife and son of the man who had supplanted him. On the whole, however, the *Burgomaster's Family* is a readable story of what it is the fashion to style the "quiet" type, although it is a mistake to represent it as being in any especial manner a portraiture of Dutch life. It will probably have many readers, and deserves them far more than the greater number of novels which pass through our hands.

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

MR. FROTHINGHAM'S "Rise of the Republic" * is, to a great extent, like most American histories, a political pamphlet under the form of history. Up to 1860 these works were mainly written against Great Britain, and their special object was to justify and glorify the revolt of the Colonies, as being the first assertion of the supreme right of a people to choose its own Government, and to "cashier" that Government if it ceased to correspond with popular wishes and feelings, without considering whether there were any adequate grounds of complaint, or recognizing the right of self-defence, which must be asserted by every authority that is to fulfil any useful purpose in the world. Their business was to uphold the right of revolution, not to magnify the grievances which had led to its exercise; and some of them, therefore, stated not unfairly the real nature of the comparatively trifling encroachments which were employed by the leaders of the revolutionary party to excite agitation in the first instance, and afterwards to ripen agitation into rebellion. On the other hand, their argument required that the Revolution should be represented as the spontaneous act of an entire and unanimous people, and the so-called Tories or Royalists as an insignificant and factious minority. Since 1860 the tone of this class of writers has changed. The right of revolution is one which they can no longer afford to acknowledge, since it was so distinctly and so unanswerably invoked against the Union. The late Horace Greeley alone of Northern Republican writers and politicians remained constant to his old faith; and he only contrived to reconcile his theoretical creed with the practical requirements of party allegiance and Federal patriotism by denying the plainest facts of the case, and disputing the reality of the Secessionist majority in the teeth of the evidence afforded by a four years' war in which, a few districts on the frontier excepted, the whole South united as one

man in a desperate resistance to the Federal Government. The present object of such writers as Mr. Frothingham is to vindicate the American Revolution on grounds which will not justify the secession of the Southern States; and accordingly the basis of argument must be changed, and the case of the "patriots" rested not on the will of the people, but on the offences of the King and Parliament of the mother-country. Consequently, as the former mode of reasoning brought out one side of the truth—the extreme triviality of the injuries inflicted on the Colonies by Imperial legislation, especially when compared with such violations of the fundamental constitution as the agitation against slavery in the States, the attempts to exclude new Slave States from the Union, and the forcible nullification of Federal law by the action of State authority in the North, not to speak of such outrages as the invasion of Virginia by John Brown, endorsed and applauded by Massachusetts and her Puritan sister—so the new argument shows the other side of the truth; namely, the extreme reluctance with which the majority of the American people were induced to sever themselves from the Empire, and the adroitness of the steps by which they were led, unknowing to what their action tended, whether the revolutionary chiefs meant to proceed. The valuable part of Mr. Frothingham's work is the account of the gradual development of the colonial theory of self-government by which he prepares the ground for the discussion of the disputes which culminated in war, and the history of the internal counsels of the extreme party, chiefly consisting of the Puritans of Massachusetts and the neighbouring colonies, during the agitation which preceded the outbreak. His view is altogether partial and one-sided; but he nevertheless does more justice than he himself is aware of to the other side, as when he acknowledges that the War of Secession has taught him and his countrymen to understand the tenacity with which the rulers and people of a great Empire resist its dismemberment. He admits that after the quarrel had once taken the shape of open resistance to Imperial authority, George III. and his Ministers only represented and gave effect to the national will—nay, only acted up to the necessities and duties of their position in resisting to the uttermost the severance from the Crown of its most precious foreign possessions. With the war in its military aspect he deals very slightly indeed, his subject being the political development of the "Republic of the United States," and not the general history of the struggle by which that development was rendered possible. He also gives some interesting particulars of the debates of the Convention which framed the Union of 1787; though, like other writers of his party, he is compelled to twist and distort that history not a little in order to make it square with the novel doctrine which denies the sovereignty of the States. It is not a little remarkable that the war of 1861 caused the triumph of the theory of Federal supremacy and national unity of which Hamilton and the party that was signally defeated in 1787 were the unsuccessful exponents; as also that the idea of the sacredness of the national territory and the primary obligation to maintain the integrity of the Empire for which Great Britain fought in 1777 is now appreciated and asserted in America, just as the predominant school of British statesmen are beginning to abandon it.

Only those who are sufficiently acquainted with the author's writings to know how thoroughly his mind is possessed by one sole idea, and how he finds evidence of its truth in every department of human thought and experience, in every fact and fallacy with which his memory is stored, would expect to find in a treatise on the Unity of Law *, even though that treatise bears the name of H. C. Carey, a vigorous, elaborate, and passionate glorification of Protection. One would think that the recent experience of America must have staggered the most ardent Protectionist unconnected with those trades which are enabled by the existing tariff to levy an enormous tax for their own benefit on the industry, commerce, and consumption of their countrymen. But Mr. Carey has no misgivings; nay, more, he cites the history of the last fifty years, under the varying course of a fiscal policy now rigidly protective, now tending towards Free-trade, as proof that the prosperity of America depends not on population or capital, not on her vast agricultural resources and her unlimited area of unappropriated land, not on her energy and her intelligence, her gold and silver, not even on her political institutions, but primarily and chiefly on her protective policy. He contrives to press all writers and all facts into his service, and cites them, we must say, with an apparently profound indifference to the authority of the one or the authenticity of the other. He forces Mr. Mill to testify against Free-trade, and arrays by the side of Parliamentary Blue Books, as of equal value in evidence, some of the most frantic declamations of Mr. Ernest Jones. He fills page after page with a demonstration that the vast amount of mechanical power brought into the service of mankind during the last half-century has been productive of no benefit except to a few millowners and merchants; that it is no advantage to the millions to get calico at sixpence a yard rather than at half-a-crown; that British manufacturers have lowered wages in England, and utterly ruined and degraded "the highly civilized people of India." In short, the factories and ironworks of this country, with all their human and mechanical productive powers, are employed in a perpetual warfare against the comfort, well-being, wealth, and

* *The Unity of Law, as exhibited in the Relations of Physical, Social, Mental, and Moral Science.* By H. C. Carey. Philadelphia: Henry Cairey. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.

* *The Unity of Law, as exhibited in the Relations of Physical, Social, Mental, and Moral Science.* By H. C. Carey. Philadelphia: Henry Cairey. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.

happiness of our own and all other peoples. If there were any truth in his reasonings, all the world ought to combine to lay waste England north of the Trent, so that not a ton of rails, not a bale of calico, not a square yard of carpet, should again be exported from that accursed region. The unconscious extravagance of Mr. Carey's tirade, the utter nonsense of the conclusions supported by such a mass of well-arranged figures and vigorous argument, the perfect unconsciousness of absurdity when he conducts his own cause to an absolute *reductio ad absurdum*, makes this book, to any one who is fairly acquainted with commercial statistics and industrial facts, a most amusing study. To people as ignorant of facts outside their own range as most Americans are, it might be dangerous from the confident energy of its misstatements and the plausibility of its fallacies; but to an English reader of practical experience or sound education it is, in its way, an intellectual treat of no ordinary kind. Such a specimen of great mental powers rendered worse than useless by the mere absence of that common sense which instinctively discerns the palpably absurd is not seen twice in the literary monstrosities of half a generation.

Mr. Coues's "Key to American Birds,"* somewhat curiously entitled, is a very large and handsome volume, beautifully printed and profusely illustrated with small woodcuts, containing a technical description of every bird found, so far as the author knows, on the Western continent north of the southern frontier of the Union. It is too brief and too purely scientific to have any interest for the general reader; but as a work of reference it seems to have no ordinary value. Every bird's head is given, and the feet of most, with plates illustrating the comparative size and shape of beaks and limbs in different families. Altogether it seems to us that such a volume was worthy of the one thing necessary to render it perfect of its kind; a coloured series of plates showing the form, plumage, and colouring of representatives of every important genus, and thus constituting it in reality a key to the study of American ornithology.

Dr. Rufus Anderson, late Foreign Secretary of the American Mission Board, publishes in two small octavo volumes a *History of the Missions to the Oriental Churches*†, i.e. of those whose special business was not to convert unbelievers to Christianity, but to convince Greeks, Armenians, and Nestorians of the superior excellence of its Protestant, and especially of its Congregational, forms. That they did some good we have no doubt; that they committed many indiscretions and provoked much enmity we can venture to affirm without any special evidence; that they incurred for their converts, and now and then for themselves, much danger and suffering, their history assures us, and the thing is probable enough. We find in these volumes, as in too many other missionary records, the same fatal vice which has been at the root of so many failures—the reliance on an arm of flesh in the background. So long as the presence of a missionary always ends in the intervention of a Consul, and the freedom to preach is vindicated, not by martyrdom, but by gunboats, princes and governments will be hostile to missionaries; and in the end those Powers which are called upon to protect or avenge the emissaries of truth will claim the right to regulate the conduct and prescribe the limits of enterprises whose ultimate consequences involve them.

Mr. Murphy's volume on the Mineral Resources of the Territory of Utah‡ contains all that we generally find in the official Reports on such subjects, arranged in a somewhat similar manner, and calculated to be interesting rather to intending speculators or emigrants than to general readers. Somewhat curiously, Mr. Murphy appends to his handbook of mining facts and statistics a brief and fragmentary history of the Mormon community and its earlier fortunes, neutral, if not friendly in tone, and such as might have been written by a Mormon anxious not to offend violently the prejudices of Gentile readers, or formally declare his belief in "the Prophet."

It is not our custom to notice new editions; but there are cases in which these may acquire, from additions or corrections, from new circumstances or new views, all the interest and much of the novelty of recent publication. There are also, among American authors, many instances in which the second or third edition is the first that practically finds its way into English hands. Mr. C. H. Bristed's *Five Years at an English University*§ derives some part of its interest from the very fact that it is an old book. In any case it would have its value, and would attract the attention of University men, and of all who care for University education, as an elaborate account of Cambridge from an American point of view. We have in it a criticism of English schools and colleges, and

* *Key to North American Birds*. Containing a concise Account of every species of Living and Fossil Bird at present known on the continent north of the Mexican and United States Boundary. Illustrated by six steel plates and upwards of two hundred and fifty woodcuts. By Elliott Coues, Assistant-Surgeon, United States Army. Salem: Naturalists' Agency. New York: Dodd & Mead. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.

† *Republication of the Gospel in Bible Lands: History of the Missions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches*. By Rufus Anderson, D.D., LL.D., late Foreign Secretary of the Board. 2 vols. Vol. I. Boston: Congregational Publishing Society. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.

‡ *The Mineral Resources of the Territory of Utah*. With Mining Statistics and Maps. By John R. Murphy. San Francisco: Bancroft & Co. Salt Lake City: James Dwyer. London: Trübner & Co. 1872.

§ *Five Years at an English University*. By Charles Astor Bristed, late Foundation Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. Third Edition. Revised by the Author. New York: Putnam & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1873.

of the higher education of English youth, by a thoughtful and painstaking observer trained in a different system, and brought up under a discipline and course of teaching very distinct from our own, who had afterwards the opportunity of making himself almost as fully acquainted with ours as we are ourselves; a description of English University life and studies, as they appeared to a stranger who went through the course of the one and shared the other; a comparison between the English and American systems by one who had ample experience of both. But in the fact that the author's experience relates to a bygone period—that nearly twenty years have elapsed since he was a Cambridge undergraduate, during which time changes have taken place that have made the University system of his day to a great extent a thing of the past—lies a new attraction for those who are too young to know for themselves what Cambridge and Trinity were before the days of Whewell, and ere yet reform had invaded their precincts. Mr. Bristed's work is, in short, not only a valuable essay on the English scheme of higher education, on our public school and college life, and on the course of studies of one of our two great centres of learning, as compared with the school and college systems of America, but a vivid and minute picture of Cambridge as it was twenty years back such as only an American could have given. A foreigner would hardly have been able to enter so thoroughly into every particular of the life around him, to understand so quickly and to share so heartily the ideas, the amusements, the work and the play of English students. An Englishman would take much more for granted, and, finding far less novelty in all around him, would have given a far less lively and less complete account of the scenes through which he passed. Mr. Bristed came to them with all a stranger's freshness, and almost a native's capacity of understanding them, and accordingly he has drawn not merely a vigorous and striking outline, but a minute and highly finished picture, of the whole which is an interesting to Englishmen as it can be to Americans. His remarks on the comparative quality and character of American and English education are candid, thoughtful, and interesting. He is struck with the superior standard of scholarship, both classical and mathematical, in this country; but he justly observes that the earlier age at which American youths pass through college, and their greater eagerness to enter the practical and remunerative business of life, necessarily curtails their studies, and impairs the completeness of their education; while the same spirit leads them to extend the area and limit the depth of their reading, and to be satisfied with a smattering of modern languages, for instance, available for conversation and travel, where an English student, if he learnt the languages at all, might be able to read them with fluency and even write them correctly long before he acquired the power of speaking them or understanding them when spoken. His description of Cambridge examinations and regulations, and of the course of a student's reading and "coaching," is the fullest we remember to have seen, and is a valuable record of a system now materially changed even in some of its vital features.

The "Old Landmarks of Boston"** belongs to a class of books very common, and, we must suppose, somewhat popular, in America—books written to glorify the past or present, the architecture and history, the scenery and climate, the commercial or political importance of particular cities. The absence of a capital given to every large town a sort of independent position and political life; none need acknowledge in any rival that sort of superiority which metropolis possesses at the centre of national life. Each American city, as of old each principal German city, is complete in itself; is itself a centre of life and thought, not a mere appendage to some central capital. And thus each American is proud of his own State and city, and takes a patriotic pleasure in its exaltation. Boston in particular has a greater and more characteristic history than any other Transatlantic city possesses; its "landmarks," though to English notions almost too recent in their origin to deserve the name of antiquities, are yet connected with striking incidents, picturesque traditions, and memories of great events and distinguished men; and though few English readers would have patience to peruse this volume from beginning to end, a visitor to or resident in Boston would find it useful as a work of reference, and interesting as enabling him to attach ideas to all the principal sites and buildings, and giving him lively associations well worth cherishing with the chief objects he will pass in his daily walks.

Back-Log Studies† is the quaint and thoroughly American title of a little rambling volume of what an English author might call Fireside Conversations and Reflections; reveries, dreams, and talks over a wood fire, and now and then suggested by it. Many of the former are original and curious; the conversations are lively, and wholly free from that tendency to tediousness which belongs to most printed dialogues; nearly every other sentence of each interlocutor introducing either a pointed expression of an old notion, or an amusing paradox, or some other contribution to the life of social intercourse; still the whole is but a collection of unconsidered trifles, very few of which are likely to be remembered when the book is laid aside.

Of original works of fiction we find this month only three that demand notice. If it were not that Bret Harte's last volume, *Mrs.*

* *Old Landmarks and Historic Personages of Boston*. By Samuel Adams Drake. Profusely illustrated. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1873.

† *Back-Log Studies*. By Charles Dudley Warner, Author of "Saunterings," "My Summer in a Garden," &c. With twenty-one Illustrations by Augustus Nodding. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1873.

Skaggs's Husbands * (a title derived from the first and wildest of the stories and fragments that compose it), must surely by this time be familiar to all our readers, we might think it necessary to describe it at some length. As it is, it will surely be enough to say that here is a new work of Bret Harte's. *Coupon Bonds* † (also entitled from its first story) consists of a variety of tales, rather longer than Mr. Harte's, and also generally of the humorous type. Finally, *How Will It End?* ‡ by J. C. Heywood, is a native romance, whose scene is laid in the midst of the Civil War, and which finds its dénouement in connexion with the surrender of the Confederate armies.

* *Mrs. Skaggs's Husbands; and other Sketches*. By Bret Harte. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1873.

† *Coupon Bonds; and other Stories*. By J. T. Trowbridge, Author of "Lawrence's Adventures," &c. With Illustrations. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1873.

‡ *How Will It End? A Romance*. By J. C. Heywood, Author of "Hedorias," "Antonius," &c. New Edition. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co.

ERRATUM.—In the article which appeared in last week's SATURDAY REVIEW entitled "The Parliamentary Notice-Paper," we spoke of Mr. MITCHELL HENRY'S Bill "for the Protection of Miners from Fraud." The measure is a Bill for the Protection of Minors.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW OF POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF NO. 304, FEBRUARY 22, 1873:

The Spanish Republic. The Lord Chancellor's Bill. Mr. Harcourt on Public Expenditure. Irish University Education. The End of the Committee of Thirty. The Galway Prosecutions. Juries. Mr. Fortescue's Railway Bill. Man and Wife (Limited).

The Philosophy of Love.

Mr. Campbell's Administration of Bengal. The Working-Man. The Ecclesiastical Contest in Switzerland. Our Masks. Warnings to Emigrants. Portuguese English. The Theatres.

George Savile, Marquis of Halifax. Hull's Building and Ornamental Stones. Never Again. Sir John Burgoyne. Eastlake's Hints on Household Taste. Recent Editions of the *Odyssey*. The Burgomaster's Family. American Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

LONDON INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION, 1873, of the Industries of Works, Carriages, Steel, Cutlery, Scientific Instruments and Food, with a Collection of Works of Art of all kinds. Tickets, admitting also to the Daily Musical Performances in the Royal Albert Hall, will be had at the Royal Albert Hall; at the Society of Arts, Adelphi; and at the usual Agents. Money-orders to be made payable to the SECRETARY, at the Post Office, in Exhibition Road.

CRYSTAL PALACE.—PARTICULAR ATTRACTIONS. THIS DAY and NEXT WEEK—LAST WEEK of "JACK and JILL." Saturday (February 22)—Seventeenth Saturday Concert at 3. Afterwards, Presentation of Prizes to London Rifle Brigade, by the Lady Mayoress, Lord Mayor, Sheriff, &c. Monday, 24th—"The Royal Opera," 8 P.M. Tuesday, 25th—The Payne Family at 7.30; "Jack and Jill." Ceremonial Reception by the Welsh Choir, Parliamentary Representatives of South Wales, of the great Challenge Prize won at the National Music Meetings, 1872.

Wednesday, 26th—A special Miscellaneous Entertainment. Thursday and Friday—The Payne Family at 3; "Jack and Jill"; Organ, 5.30. Saturday—Eighteenth Saturday Concert, at 3.

The Fine Arts Courts and Collections, including the Technological and Natural History Collections, all the various illustrations of Art, Science, and Nature, and the Gardens and Park always open. Music and Fountains daily.

Admission, Monday to Friday, 1s.; Saturdays, 2s. 6d.; or by Guinea Season Ticket.

ALEXANDRA PALACE, MUSWELL HILL, N.

ALEXANDRA PALACE of ART and INDUSTRY.

THE ALEXANDRA PALACE will OPEN in MAY.

ALEXANDRA PALACE. FINE ART DEPARTMENT. EXHIBITORS' DEPARTMENT. BAZAAR DEPARTMENT.

ALEXANDRA PALACE.—FORMS of APPLICATION for a SPACE may be obtained from the Manager. Plans of the arrangement of the Building may be seen at the Manager's Office.

ALEXANDRA PALACE, MUSWELL HILL, N.

MONDAY POPULAR CONCERTS, St. James's Hall.—On Monday Evening next, February 26, the Programme will include Mendelssohn's Quintet in A major, Haydn's Quartet in G major, Beethoven's Sonata in D major for Piano and Violin, and Schubert's Fantasy Sonata in G major for Piano alone. Executants: Madame Schumann, M.M. Joachim, L. Ries, Straka, Zerbini, and Piatini. Vocalist, Madame Lewrowska. Conductor, Mr. Zerbini. Box Stalls, 5s.; Balcony, 3s.; Admission, 1s. Tickets and Programmes at Chappell & Co.'s, 30 New Bond Street; and at the Hall, 36 Piccadilly.

LONDON BALLAD CONCERTS, St. James's Hall.—NOTICE. There will be no Concert on Ash-Wednesday, February 26. The two last EVENING CONCERTS will be given on Wednesdays, March 5 and 12. The following CONCERTS will be given on Thursdays, March 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, and 5th April:—Pianoforte: Mr. Sims Reeves, Mr. Henry Guy, and Mr. Sydney Smith; and Madame Pianoforte: Miss Georgina Maudslay, Mr. Henry Guy. Principal Violin, Herr Straus; Accompanist, Dr. Heap; Conductors, Mr. Manns and Mr. Walter Bache. Stalls, 10s. 6d.; area, 5s.; balcony, 3s.; admission, 1s.—Stanley Laces, Weber & Co., 34 New Bond Street; usual Agents; and Austin's Ticket Office, St. James's Hall.

MR. WALTER BACHE'S NINTH ANNUAL ORCHESTRAL CONCERT. Friday Evening, February 26, St. James's Hall, half-past Eight. Lit. 12th Psalm, first performance in England. Schumann's Concerto in A minor. Pianoforte, Mr. Walter Bache.—Wagner's Huldigungsmarsch (first time), &c. &c. St. Miss Sophie Ferrari, Miss Georgina Maudslay, Mr. Henry Guy. Principal Violin, Herr Straus; Accompanist, Dr. Heap; Conductors, Mr. Manns and Mr. Walter Bache. Stalls, 10s. 6d.; area, 5s.; balcony, 3s.; admission, 1s.—Stanley Laces, Weber & Co., 34 New Bond Street; usual Agents; and Austin's Ticket Office, St. James's Hall.

ROYAL ACADEMY of ARTS, Burlington House.—The EXHIBITION of WORKS of the OLD MASTERS, together with WORKS of DECEASED ARTISTS of the BRITISH SCHOOL, in Oil, Water-Colour, and Sculpture, is NOW OPEN. Admission (from 9 A.M. till Dusk) 1s. Catalogue, 6d. Season Tickets, 5s.

JOHN PRESCOTT KNIGHT, R.A., Secretary.

THE SOCIETY of PAINTERS in WATER-COLOURS.—The WINTER EXHIBITION of SKETCHES and STUDIES will CLOSE on Saturday next, March 1. 5 Pall Mall East. Ten till Five. Admission, 1s.

ALFRED D. FRIPP, Secretary.

DORÉ'S GREAT PICTURE of "CHRIST LEAVING the PRETORIUM," with "Triumph of Christianity," "Christian Martyrs," "Francesca da Rimini," "Neophytes," "Titania," &c., at the DORÉ GALLERY, 36 New Bond Street. Ten to Six. Admission, 1s.

CHELTENHAM COLLEGE.—TWELVE SCHOLARSHIPS. Two, £50; Six, £40; Four, £20. Election, Second week in May.—Apply to the SECRETARY, The College, Cheltenham.

TRINITY COLLEGE, Glenalmond, Perth, N.B. Warden.—Rev. R. THORNTON, D.D. Oxon.

A School on the model of the greater Public Schools of England. Terms (including every necessary expense) 80s. to 120s. according to place. There is also a Theological Department, for Candidates for Holy Orders. Particulars may be obtained from THE WARDEN.

THE LADIES' COLLEGE, Grosvenor Square, SOUTHAMPTON. Founded by the Hampshire Association for Promoting Female Education. Patron, The Bishop of WESSEX; VISCOUNT EVERSLEY; Lord NORTH-BROOK; President, The Right Hon. HENRY CONVENTEFIELD, M.P. The SPRING TERM commences May 1. Applications for the Prospectus and for Entries may be addressed to the HONORARY SECRETARY, or to the Lady Principal, Miss DANIELS.

THE Right Rev. Bishop STALEY (formerly Wrangler and Fellow of his College) wishes to receive TWO STUDIOS BOYS, as Companion Pupils with his Son, aged Fifteen Years. No Village. Fishing, Boating, Good Stabling, &c. Horses kept. Terms, 150 Guineas.—Address, Croxall Vicarage, near Tamworth.

FOLESTONE.—Mr. W. J. JEAFFRESON, M.A. Oxon (formerly Principal of the Elphinstone High School, Bombay), will continue with the Assistance of a Cambridge Honours-Man, to prepare PUPILS for the Universities, Indian Civil Service, Woolwich, and all Competitive Examinations.—Terms and References on application.

A GENTLEMAN (formerly in the Army), Married, living on his own Estate, in one of the best parts of Hants, assisted by a Militia Officer of great Experience in Tuition, wishes to receive SIX PUPILS to prepare them for the University, Civil Service, and Competitive Examinations. Both Gentlemen well versed in Modern Languages acquired abroad. Church of England. The Advertiser, from his position, can offer exceptional advantages. Highest references given and required.—Address, C. C. King's Library, Afton, Hants.

EPILEPSY, &c.—A MARRIED PHYSICIAN, residing at Brighton, receives a few afflicted CHILDREN of the Upper Classes requiring constant Medical Supervision, with judicious Training, and such an amount of Instruction as each case may be found susceptible of. Inclusive Terms, 150 Guineas.—Address, M.D., Wakeling's Library, Brighton.

HYDROPATHY.—SUDBROOK PARK, Richmond Hill. Physician.—Dr. EDWARD LANE, M.A., M.D. Edin. Turkish Baths. Consultations daily (Sunday excepted) at 7 Prince's Street, Hanover Square, from Ten till Twelve.

OVERLAND ROUTE.—The PENINSULAR and ORIENTAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY BOOK PASSENGERS and receive Cargo and Parcels by their Steamers for

	FROM SOUTHAMPTON (calling at Azores).	FROM BRINDISI.
GIBRALTAR	Every Thursday.	
MALTA	at 2 p.m.	
ALEXANDRIA	Every Thursday.	Every Monday.
ADMIRALTY	at 2 p.m.	at 5 a.m.
BOMBAY	at 2 p.m.	Morning.
GALLE		
MADRAS		
COLOMBO		
PENANG	Thursday, Feb. 13 and 27, at 2 p.m.	Friday Morning.
SINGAPORE		Monday, Feb. 21 and 28, at 2 p.m.
CHINA		March 7, at 2 p.m.
JAPAN		
AUSTRALIA		
NEW ZEALAND	Thursday, Feb. 13, at 2 p.m.	Friday Morning.
(Cargo only)		Monday, Feb. 21, at 2 p.m.

Abatements are made in favour of Passengers returning by the Company's Steamers within Six or Twelve Months of their arrival.

Passengers are now booked through, via Bombay to the principal Railway Stations in India, and through Tickets to Venice and Brindisi are issued at the Company's Office. Tickets to and through Steamers can also be obtained from Messrs. LEHANE & CO., 3 Billiter Street (South Italian Railway Office).

For Rates of Passage Money and Freight, and all other information, apply at the Company's Office, 122 Leadenhall Street, London, or Oriental Place, Southampton.

INDIAN PARCEL POST. Under Authority from the POSTMASTER-GENERAL of INDIA.

Parcels not exceeding fifty pounds in weight and 2 ft. x 1 ft. x 1 ft. in size, and £20 in value, are conveyed by the PENINSULAR and ORIENTAL COMPANY from London to any Post Town in India at a uniform charge of 1s. 4d. per lb. Full Particulars on application at

12 LEADENHALL STREET, E.C.

WINTER SEASON.—GRANVILLE HOTEL, St. Lawrence.—See *Advertiser*. During the Winter Months a Reduction of 25 per cent. will be made upon Apartments taken by the Week, Board, 25s. a week; Apartments according to size and position; Attendance, 1s. a day. Hydropathic, Turkish, or one and every description of Bath in the Hotel. Table-d'hôte at 6.30 P.M.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Every endeavour is made to render this Hotel equal to its long-existing repute. Spacious Coffee Room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel.—Communications to THE MANAGER, Bedford Hotel Company, Limited.

JAMES BLACKWOOD & CO., Publishers.—Estimates given on application, and all Communications promptly attended to.—Lovell's Court, Paternoster Row, London.

MARION & CO. 22 and 23 Soho Square, London. PHOTOGRAPHS of all kinds may be inspected and purchased. Collections of Photographs, &c., re-arranged, re-mounted, bound, or portfolios. Agents for the sale of BOURNE & SHEPHERD'S Indian Photographs, NOTMAN'S Canadian Photographs, BEDFORD'S Eastern Photographs, and many others.

RODRIGUES' MONOGRAMS, ARMS, CRESTS, and ADDRESSES designed and stamped as *Geneva*. RAISED, RUSTIC, GROTESQUE, and ECCENTRIC MONOGRAMS artistically designed for any combination of Letters. NOTE PAPER and ENVELOPES stamped in Colour Relief, and brilliantly illuminated in Gold, Silver, and Colour, in the highest style of ART. CARD-PLATE elegantly engraved, and 100 Superfine Cards printed for 1s. 6d.

AT HENRY RODRIGUES', 18 PICCADILLY, LONDON.

CAUTION.—THE "NEW CHARTA PERFECTA. COURT NOTE PAPER." Required. The Public are respectfully informed that the "NEW COURT NOTE PAPER" (as used by the Royal Family) is to be had only of JENNER & KNEWSTUBB, Herdick Engravers, Stationers, &c., by Special Appointments to their Royal Highnesses the Prince and Princess of Wales, 33 St. James's Street, and 66 Jermyn Street, S.W.

THE ASTRONOMER-ROYAL Reported to the Admiralty (August 13, 1870), on 40 Chronometers entered for annual competition, "M. F. DENT's" is the finest we have ever had on trial."—M. F. DENT, Chronometer, Watch, and Clock Maker to the Queen, 33 COCKSPUR STREET, CHARING CROSS.

ISSUE of SIX PER CENT. DEBENTURES of the CREDIT FONCIER of ENGLAND, Limited.

Directors.

FRANCIS MOWATT, Esq., Chairman,
ALEXANDER FAIRLIE CUNNINGHAM, Esq.
General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR, K.C.B. and M.P.
Lieut.-Colonel FRANCIS DOUGLAS GREY.

Bankers.

Messrs. SMITH, PAYNE, & SMITHS,
THE CONSOLIDATED BANK, Limited.
THE NATIONAL BANK of SCOTLAND.
THE BANK of SCOTLAND.

Financial Secretary—H. J. BARKER.

The CREDIT FONCIER of ENGLAND, Limited, is prepared to issue, on application, Debentures to the amount of £50,000. These Debentures are intended, partly, to replace all the outstanding Debentures of the Company—amounting to £150,000—shortly beginning to fall due, and, partly, to supply additional funds required by the great increase in the business of the Company.

They will be issued at the price of £5 per £100, and, for a term of seven years, will bear Interest at 6 per cent. per annum, payable semi-annually, and they will be redeemable at par, by equal Half-yearly Drawings, to commence on December 1 of next year.

The payment for the Debentures will be required as follows, viz.:

10 per cent. on Application.
10 " " on Allotment.
20 " " on April 1.
20 " " on May 1.
20 " " on June 3.

and the balance of £36 " on June 3; but the whole amount can be paid on any of the dates above mentioned, and the interest will commence from the date of such payments.

The Debentures will be for the different sums of £20, £30, £100, £500, and £1,000, as may be desired by applicants, and will be payable to bearer. They will have Coupons attached to them for each quarter's interest.

The Half-yearly Drawings will take place at the Offices of the Company, in the presence of a Notary Public, twenty-one days before the respective half-yearly days on which the Bonds are to be paid off.

Public notice of such Drawings will be given ten days previously, in one or more London daily newspapers, and, immediately after each Drawing, notice will be given, in a similar manner, of the numbers and amount of the Bonds drawn, and to be paid off.

The Debentures will be issued to the applicants as soon as the payment in full upon them has been completed; meanwhile, Scrip Certificates will be granted on payment of the sum due on Allotment.

Application for these Debentures must be made on the prescribed Forms, which can be had at the Offices of the Company, and must be sent in on or before March 1, after which no application will be entertained.

The CREDIT FONCIER has—besides a paid-up Capital of £1,250,000—an uncalled Capital of £20,000, and a Reserve Fund of £100,000. The Company paid a dividend of £20 of £100 per Cent., and last year of Nine per Cent.

St. Clement's House, Clement's Lane, Lombard Street,
London, February 14, 1873.

CLERICAL, MEDICAL, and GENERAL LIFE ASSOCIATION.

Established 1834.

Directors.

Chairman—The Right Hon. JOHN ROBERT MOWBRAY, M.P., D.C.L.

Deputy-Chairman.

WILLIAM BOWMAN, Esq., F.R.S.
Sir CHARLES LOCOCK, Bart., D.C.L., F.R.S.

Jas. M. Arnott, Esq., F.R.S.
Lionel S. Beale, M.B., F.R.S.
Patrick Black, M.D.
Charles J. Dering, M.B., F.R.S.
Arch. Fawcett, F.R.S.
Professor Humphry, M.D., F.R.S.
Rev. John Edwd. Kempe, M.A.

Gen. W. Lydekker, Esq., M.A.
Rev. Richd. Michell, D.D.
The Viscount Midleton
Sir Jas. M. Lomax, M.B., F.R.S.
Gen. H. Pinckard, Esq.
Thomas Pruding Teale, M.B.
Sir Fredk. M. Williams, Bt., M.P.

Actuary and Secretary—GEORGE CUTCLIFFE, Esq.

Assistant Actuary—BENJAMIN NEWBATT, Esq.

FINANCIAL RESULTS.

The Annual Income, steadily increasing, exceeds £217,000.
The Assurance Fund, safely invested, is over £1,810,000.
The New Policies in the last year were 515, assuring £275,710.
The New Annual Premiums were £3,651.
The Total Claims by Death paid amount to £3,088,829.
The Subsisting Assurances and Bonuses amount to £3,733,799.

DISTINCTIVE FEATURES.

CREDIT SYSTEM.—On any Policy for the whole duration of a healthy Life, where the age does not exceed 60, one half of the Annual Premiums during the first five years may remain on credit.

ENDOWMENT ASSURANCES may be effected, without Profits, by which the Sum Assured becomes payable on the attainment of a specified age, or at death, whichever event shall first happen.

INVALID LIVES may be assured at rates proportioned to the increased risk.

PROMPT SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS.—Claims paid thirty days after proof of death.

BONUS.

The Reversionary Bonus at the Quinquennial Division in January, 1872 (amounting to £20,000) averaged 10 per Cent., and the Cash Bonus 20 per Cent. on the Premiums paid in the five years.

The next Division of Profits will take place in January, 1877, and Persons who effect New Policies before the end of June next will be entitled at that Division to one year's additional share of Profits over later Entrants.

REPORT, 1872.

The Annual Report just issued, and the Balance Sheets for the year ending June 30, 1872, as rendered to the Board of Trade, can be obtained of any of the Society's Agents, or of

GEORGE CUTCLIFFE, Actuary and Secretary,
13 St. James's Square, London, S.W.

PELICAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

ESTABLISHED IN 1757.

70 LOMBARD STREET, CITY, AND 57 CHARING CROSS, WESTMINSTER.

Directors.

Henry R. Bond, Esq., M.P.
Gen. E. Coote, Esq.
John Cooper, Esq.
Henry Farquhar, Esq.
Charles Emanuel Goodhart, Esq.
Kirckman D. Hodgson, Esq., M.P.

Henry Lancelot Holland, Esq.;
Sir John Lubbock, Bart., M.P., F.R.S.
John Stew Okey, Esq.
Benjamin Shaw, Esq.
Dudley Robert Smith, Esq.
Marmaduke Wyvill, Esq.

This Company offers COMPLETE SECURITY.

Moderate Rates of Premium, with Participation in Four-fifths or Eighty per cent. of the Profits.

Low Rates without Participation in Profits.

LOANS in connexion with Life Assurance, on approved Security, in Sums of not less than £500.

ANNUAL PREMIUM required for the Assurance of £100, for the Whole Term of Life:

Age.	Without Profits.	With Profits.	Age.	Without Profits.	With Profits.
15	£1 11 0	£1 15 0	40	£2 18 10	£2 6 5
20	1 10 0	1 10 3	50	4 0 9	4 10 7
25	2 4 0	2 10 4	60	5 1 0	5 7 4

ROBERT TUCKER, Secretary and Actuary.

PHEONIX FIRE OFFICE,
LOMBARD STREET AND CHARING CROSS, LONDON.—ESTABLISHED 1752.

Prompt and liberal Loss Settlements.

Insurances effected in all parts of the World.

GEO. W. LOVELL, Secretary.

UNIVERSITY LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

25 PALL MALL, LONDON, S.W.

Amount of Capital originally subscribed, £600,000, on which has been paid up £200,000.

Amount accumulated from Premiums £600,000.

Annual Income £97,000.

Amount of Policies in existence and outstanding Additions, upwards of £2,000,000.

Additions to Policies at the Ninth Division of Profits, 21 per cent. per annum.

The Tenth Quinquennial Division of Profits, June 1873.

CHARLES McCABE, Secretary.

THE AGRA BANK, Limited.—Established in 1833.

CAPITAL, £1,000,000.

HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS LANE, LOMBARD STREET, LONDON.

BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

Current Accounts are kept at the Head Office on the Terms mentioned with London Bankers, and Interest allowed when the Credit Balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:

At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' Notice of Withdrawal.

For shorter periods Deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank, free of Exchange and Approved Bills purchased for present collection.

Sales and Purchases of Gold in India and Foreign Securities, in East India Stock and London Stock, and in the case of India, of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn, and Army, Navy, and Civil Pay and Pensions realized.

Every other description of Banking Business and Money Agency, British and Indian, transacted.

J. THOMSON, Chairman.

IMPERIAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1863.

1 OLD BROAD STREET, E.C., and 16 and 17 PALL MALL, S.W.

CAPITAL, £1,600,000. PAID UP AND INVESTED, £700,000.

JAMES HOLLAND, Superintendent.

EAGLE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1867. (For Lives only.)

79 PALL MALL, LONDON.

GEORGE HUMPHREYS, Actuary and Secretary.

PATENTED IMPROVEMENT in WATCHES.—E. DENT & CO., 61 Strand and 34 Royal Exchange, Manufacturers to Her Majesty, makers of the New Standard Clock of the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, &c., invite attention to their NEW PATENT ESCAPEMENT for HALF CHRONOMETER WATCHES, which renders them less susceptible to injury, and corrects those errors of performance which generally arise from rough usage. Catalogues on application, 61 Strand, and 34 Royal Exchange (adjoining Lloyd's), London.

CUTLERY, Warranted.—The most varied Assortment of TABLE CUTLERY in the World, all warranted, is on Sale at WILLIAM S. BURTON'S.

The Blades are all of the finest Steel.

Table Knives s. d. Dessert Knives s. d. Carvers s. d.

3/4-inch Ivory Handles per Dozen 19 15 per Pair 7 .

3/4-inch Balance ditto 20 16 8 .

3/4-inch ditto 22 21 10 .

4/4-inch fine Ivory Handles 27 23 10 .

4/4-inch extra large ditto 40 30 10 6 .

4/4-inch African Ivory ditto 45 35 15 .

4/4-inch ditto 48 38 18 .

Ditto with Silvered Blades 25 42 10 6 .

WILLIAM S. BURTON, General Furnishing Ironmonger, by appointment, to H.R.H. the Prince of Wales, sends a CATALOGUE, containing upwards of 500 Illustrations of his unrivalled Stock, with Lists of Prices and Plans of the 30 large Show-rooms, post free.

39 Oxford Street, W.; 1, 1A, 2, 3 and 4 Newman Street; 4, 5 and 6 Perry's Place; and 1 Newman Lane, London, W. The Court of Directors' Goods, and the most distant parts of the United Kingdom by Railway is trifling. WILLIAM S. BURTON will always undertake delivery at a small fixed rate.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE or APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT on MOEDER'S FIRE SYSTEM. Cash Prices; no Extra Charges. Large, useful Stock to select from. All Goods Warranted. Terms post free; with Illustrated Price Catalogue, three stamps—2d and 2d Tottenhams Court Road. Established 1862.

CLARK'S PATENT STEEL NOISELESS SHUTTERS, Self-Closing, Fire and Theft Proof, can be adapted to any Window or other Opening. Prospectus free. CLARK & CO., Sole Patentees, Rathbone Place, W.; Paris, Manchester, Liverpool, and Dublin.

SMEE'S DESIGNS of FURNITURE and IRON and BRASS BEDSTEADS.

A New and Revised Edition of this Work is now issued, in a size convenient for transmission by post, and will be forwarded, on application, by

W. A. & S. SMEE,

6 FINSBURY PAVEMENT, LONDON.

EASY CHAIRS and SOFAS.—HOWARD & SONS, Manufacturers, solicit an inspection of their Stock, which is of the most varied description. The most luxurious seats possible. SHOW ROOMS—25, 26, & 27 Berners Street, Oxford Street, W. SIEGES DE PLUME. Howard's Patent. THE most luxurious seats possible. SHOW ROOMS—25, 26, & 27 Berners Street, London, W. HOWARD & SONS.

ESTABLISHED 1864.

TIMEWELL, SPECIAL TAILOR and MILITARY OUTFITTER to Gentlemen who require no Credit, 8 Sackville Street, Piccadilly, W.—A private trade of highest class and character, yielding to its patrons the full advantages of their position." Book of Prices post free.

LADIES' FUR-LINED BOOTS, 18s. 6d. Boots for Skating. Guineas Cork-soled Elastic Boots. Velvet Boots, 5s. 6d. Slippers, 3s. 6d. Catalogues post free. THOMAS D. MARSHALL, 192 Oxford Street, W.

SANITARY.—DR. ALFRED CARPENTER'S SYSTEM of re-arranging DRAINS and WATER-PIPES carried out. Self-evident that it is the only plan that can be effectual.—F. FRESHWATER, Builder, 74a Kensington Park Road, Notting Hill.

FUNERAL REFORM.—The LONDON NECROPOLIS COMPANY conducts FUNERALS with Simplicity and with great Economy. Prospectus free.—Chief Office, 2 Lancaster Place, Strand, W.C.

FIELD'S PATENT "OZOKERIT" CANDLES. Improved in color. Improved in burning. No advance in price.

SOLD EVERYWHERE.

IRON WINE BINS.—FARROW & JACKSON (Business established 1798). First Wrought-Iron Wine Bins, invented and made by the late Mr. Farrow in 1821. First Wine Bin, with separate rest for each bottle, registered by present firm. Mansell Street, London. The first Wine Bin, with separate rest for each bottle (but so arranged that the necks of the bottles are outward), an advantage peculiar to this form of Wine Bin, registered by them March 28, 1862.—16 Great Tower Street, 8 Haymarket, E.C.

SALT & CO.'S EAST INDIA PALE and BURTON ALES, in Bottles, also in Cask, in the finest Condition. CHAMPAGNE—Bouy, 4s.; Carte Blanche, 3s.; Sillery, 2s.; per dozen. PORT—Cockburn's Old Crusted, 4s.; 3s.; 3s.; Draught, 2s. per dozen. SHERRY—S. Fino, 3s.; Fino, 3s.; Pale or Gold, 2s. per dozen. CLARET—Good, 1s.; Superior, 1s.; 1s.; 2s. per dozen.—MOODY & CO., 40 Lime Street, London, E.C.

KINAHAN'S. L.L. WHISKY. This celebrated and most delicious old mellow Spirit is the very CREAM of IRISH WHISKIES, is unrivalled, perfectly pure, and more wholesome than the finest Cognac Brandy. Note the Red Seal, Pink Label, and Cork branded "Kinahan's. L.L. Whisky."

Wholesale Depôt, 29 GREAT TITCHFIELD STREET, OXFORD STREET, W.

E. LAZENBY & SON'S PICKLES, SAUCES, and CONDIMENTS.—E. LAZENBY & SON, Sole Proprietors of the celebrated Receipts, and Manufacturers of Pickles, Sauces, and Condiments, long and favourably distinguished by their Name, are compelled to CAUTION the Public against imitating their Products, which are put up and labelled in close imitation of their Goods, with a view to mislead the Public.—92 Wigmore Street, Cavendish Square (late 6 Edwards Street, Portman Square), and 1 Trinity Street, London, S.E.

HARVEY'S SAUCE.—Caution.—The Admirers of this celebrated Sauce are particularly requested to observe that each Bottle, prepared by E. LAZENBY & SON, bears the seal used so many years, signed "Elizabeth Lazenny."

REAL TURTLE SOUP.

McCALL'S WEST INDIA TURTLE.

Real Turtle Soup in Quart, Pint, and Half-pint Tins, ready for Immediate Use.

Callipash and Callipee in 2 lb. and 1 lb. Tins.

British and Indian Turtleshell.

To be had at all First-class Italian Warehouses, and Wholesale of JOHN McCALL & CO., 131 Houndsditch, E.C.